THE AGE OF SHANKARA

BY

UDAYAVIR SHASTRI

Vidyabhaskar, Ved Ratna, Nyaya Tirtha,
Samkhya-Yoga Tirtha, Vedantacharya,
Vidyavachaspati

Translated into English

by

Lakshmi Datta Dikshit
Formerly Principal and Fellow
Panjab University

Published by Virjanand Vedic Research Institute
Sanyas Ashram, Gaziabad-201001

First Edition—1981

Price : Rs. 25/-

Printed at 'Janashakti Mudran Yantralaya'
K-17, Navin Shahdara. Delhi-32

FOREWORD

The most distinguished scholiast of the Brahma Sutras in modern estimation, is the celebrated Shankaracharya. He is regarded as an unquestioned authority on Vedantic dogmatics and his position among the propounders of Vedantic philosophy is unique. His very name has an auspicious significance. Whatever may be the real import of the Vedanta Sutras, the philosophy of Shankar has since been unalterately identified with the Vedanta philosophy ; it is "Vedanta par excellence."

Shankar's gloss or perpetual commentary of the Sutras has been annotated and interpreted by a herd of eminent commentators like Vachaspati Mishra. These multiplied expositions of the text and the gloss furnish an unexhaustible fund of controvertial disquisition, suited to the disputations of schoolmen of India. Besides his monumental work, the interpretation of the Brahmasutra, Shankar wrote commentaries on the Gita and on all the principal or important upnishads. He is author likewise, of several distinct treatises, the most noted of which is the Upadesha Sahasri, a meterical summary of the doctrine deduced from the upanishads and the Brahma Sutra in his commentaries on these original works.

The importance of determining the period when this illustrious philosopher flourished cannot be overemphasised. Opinions differ on the subject. That inevitable in the absence of any clear-cut evidence given by the author himself. Shankar and his chief disciple Sureshwaracharya are tagged with Dharmakirti and other Buddhist philosophers whom they have quoted and discussed in their works. But these Buddhist

philosophers also did not indicate their time in their works. Whatever modern scholars have done on the subject is only an attempt to determine their time on the basis of external evidence According to those who have discussed his antiquity the period when Shankar flourished may be taken to have been the close of the 7th or the beginning of the 8th century of the Christian era. This has been confirmed by the concerning opinions of a host of modern scholars—European as well as Indian who followed them.

Westernism has taught us false values. The traditions of modern historical research founded by European scholars of repute were unfortunately coloured with race prejudice, their attitude towards Greece, Egypt and Rome and their bias for Christianity. In fact they could not conceive of anything good or great before the advent of christianity. When they sat down to write they felt as if they were the judges sent down from some region above and the country of Shankaracharya to be criminals whose case they had to judge. It is really unfortunate that Indians had to learn their own history from foreign scholars. These scholars with insufficient data and superficial knowledge of our traditions wrote text books on Indian history which were mainly responsible for a good deal of erroneous views about our past, as prevailing among the educated Indians. In fact we cannot develop our faith in our traditions if our scholars still continue to depend upon the versions of our ancient history of the European type for telling us what we were. To understand, to recapture and live upto the best in our traditions, it is necessary for a scholar to discover for himself the truth enveloped in obscurity and made hazy in the name of research.

There are traditional tales recorded in the later literature to shed light on the biography of Shankar. But their authenticity is of uncertain nature, as long they are not substantiated by contemporary evidence. Now-a-days attempts are made to arrive at conclusions in chronological matters from parallel ideas and expressions. But this is not a correct and safe method ; because Indian thought-pattern is made up of much that is traditionally inherited from the past, besides here

being many under-currents and cross-currents the clues of which are not necessarily detected. Secondly, we cannot lay much reliance on the dates given in later literature, because they are not contemporary records ; and further, their details are full of inconsistencies and anachronisms often based in unidentified works. Chronology needs a certain type of evidence which we must try to discover before assigning a specific date of any author.

Under the circumstances, it is safer to put together such data as helps us to fix the relative chronology of different authors and their works. Shankar's age also needed to be fixed in the same manner. It is necessary to go to the original sources instead of relying on the writing of those who could not have access to them. And this is exactly what the renowned philosopher of our times, Acharya Udayavir Shastri, has done in determining the age of Shankar. The tradition recorded in the four Mathas, established by Shankar himself, is quite uniform and continues undisturbed uptodate. In the face of such well established evidence, their can be no justification for giving credibility to statements or arguments which are based on mere conjectures. For instance, when A.B. Keith, the reputed orientalist, says in his 'History of Sanskrit Literature' (P.476) that "Shankar *may* have been born in 788 and *may* have died *or* become Sanysin in 820 A.D." it is clear that he is not sure of what he says. How can a whole structure be constructed on such loose grounds ? Similarly, it is argued that since Huen Tsang who visited India in the 7th Century did not mention the name of Shankar in his memoirs. He should not have been born by that time. But then, Huen Tsang made no mention of the Gita, the Brahma Sutra and the Upanishads in his list of sacred books of this country. Should we, on that account, conclude that these had not yet been composed? In fact, Huen Tsang had come to India with the avowed purpose of studying Buddhism. He went back with 20 horseloads of 675 books on Buddhism. Taking notice of Shankar and Vedic literature was not within his purview. Such like statements and arguments fail to carry conviction with any critic.

The material available on the subject needed the eye of a keen observer and the analytical mind of a genius who

could dig deep before truth could reveal itself. The present work is the result of the strenuous efforts of the author spread over a long period. To arrive at the truth about the history of those times, we will have to strive to strike at the root—the date of Lord Buddha. While the world celebrated the 25th century of Lord Buddha, the author revolutionised historical research by revealing that he actually flourished some 1800 years before Christ. I hope this pioneer work will serve as a very useful guide and torch-bearer in the field of independent research work in this country.

—Vidyanand Saraswati

Publisher's Note

A philosophical doctrine, as it is repeated in the course of centuries, is coloured by the reflections of the age in which it appears and bears the imprint of the individual who restates it. This is equally true in the case of the works of Shankaracharya which have exercised a great influence on Indian philosophical thought, extending over a period of more than two thousand years. It is, therefore, in the fitness of things to see Shankaracharya in a true historical perspective.

Acharya Udayavir Shastri, who already has to his credit a number of books of imperishable significance, has, in the present work, set forth in precise and penetrating words, some little known facts bearing upon the data necessary for determining the age of Shankaracharya. The book is not the product of purely scholarly interest, but has grown out of the vital urges and under pressure of a concrete historical situation.

I am greatly indebted to Shri L. D. Dikshit, a former Principal and Fellow of the Punjab Universitv, for the strenuous work he has done in translating the book (originally written in Hindi) into English, for the benefit of those who are not conversant with Hindi. I am also thankful to Shri Swami Vidyanand Sarasvati for writing the foreword.

My grateful thanks are due to Swami Giranand Saraswati of Anupshahar (Rs. 1500/-), Shri Karam Chand Advocate of New Rajendranagar Delhi (Rs. 890/-) and Rai Sahib Chowdhary Pratap Singh of Karnal (Rs. 321/-) but for whose financial assistance it should not have been possible for the Sansthan to bring out the book in time.

The publication of the book was delayed on account of some trouble with tbe press. I must still thank the propreitor Shri Mahendra Singh, who is otherwise quite co-operating.

Satyanand Saraswati
President

Translator's Apology

No translation can bring out the dignity and grace of the original. The translator's anxiety is to render the thought. He cannot fully convey the spirit. He can never evoke in the reader the mood in which the thought was born and induce in him the ecstacy of the seer and the vision he holds. Realising that, for me at any rate, it is difficult to bring out, through the medium of English, the dignity of the phrase and the intensity of utterance, I have tried to make it acceptable to all but those who are scrupulous about scholarly accuracy.

—L. D. Dikshit

Chapter 1

ACHARYA SHANKAR AND THE ORDER OF HIS GURUS

Acharya Shankar tops the list of the eminent commentators of Vedantic tradition. With a view to propagating his ideology, he established, in the four extremeties of India, monasteries now known as 'Maths.' These Maths went a long way in transmitting his school of philosophy. This bears out his sagacity, keen insight and wonderful organisational capacity. He passed away at an early age of thirty-two but his achievement in such a short span of life was unique.

One is simply amazed when he goes through the life of this great thinker. At the early age of sixteen when an ordinary man is yet to determine his course in life, the Acharya, having thoroughly studied the scriptures, had completed his commentary of the 'Brahm Sutra.' The commentary being as perfect as humanly possible, has merited reverance from scholars of all ages. The clarity and beauty of language, its immense capacity to convey the desired sense and the lucidity of style are revealed at every step in the commentary.

He is said to be an incarnation of "Lord Shanker" having descended in human form. From times immemorial Indian society has been traditionally prone to confer Divinity on great men as a token of their immense appreciation for their extraordinary exploits. You will hardly find a great man in the history of India, who has not been deified i.e. admitted as God or His representative deity. Every such soul is invariably pronounced as an incarnation of Brahma-Vishnu-Shankar-Saraswati-Brihaspati or any other favourite deity. But in doing that we forget that while we are actually ignoring his greatness we

are attributing the same to God for whom it has little meaning. Acharya Shankar was no exception. Anyhow, we hold him in high esteem and he serves as a beacon light for us all.

Shankar : Jagat-Guru or World Teacher

There is no doubt that the study and teaching of Shankar's commentary on 'Brahm Sutra' eclipsed all previous commentaries. Indian society has always been religious minded. The Guru has always been held in great esteem.[1] The Veneration for 'Maths' established by Acharya Shankar continues unabated to this day. The Adi (first) Shankaracharya, initially accepted as Guru by Indian Society was subsequently elevated as Jagadguru (world teacher) by the society in general. It is only due to his tremendous work that the head of every 'Math' established by him is even today called Jagadguru Shankarcharya. Undoubtedly every head of such a Math is a great scholar, a man of character and one having full control over his senses. They command implicit faith in society.

Shankar's commentary of Brahm Sutra:

With the advent of the study of Shankar's commentary of Brahm Sutras and Upanishadas a new wave arose in the spiritual world sweeping away the spiritual sentiments created by his predecessors. The study of old commentaries became obsolete and in course of time they were lost. As a matter of fact they perished through disuse. In the sphere of spiritual and Vedantic interpretation, the whole literary world is today considerably influenced by the views of Shankar.

In the post—Shankar period a number of scholars made considerable efforts to preserve the spiritual traditions of Vedant prevailing before the advent of Shankar but they could not

1. 'यस्य देवे परा भक्तिर्यथा देवे तथा गुरौ'। श्वेता. ६-२३

गुरुर्ब्रह्मा गुरुर्विष्णुः गुरुर्देवो महेश्वरः।
गुरुरेव परं ब्रह्म, तस्मै श्रीगुरवे नमः॥
(स्तोत्र)

'गुरु बिन कौन वतावे बाट'
(एक गीत)

succeed. The commentaries of Bhaskar, Ramanuj, Shrikanth, Madhwa, Vallabh, Nimbark and others remained confined to their sects. At best they are taken notice of by those who want to study the subjects from all angles. If one were to study or teach Vedant in a non sectarian way Shankar's commentary will get precedence over all.

The Lineage of Acharya Shankar:

According to the 'Pushpikas' (पुष्पिका)[1] contained in the works of Shankar the name of his Guru was certainly Govind Bhagwatpada. Bhagwat herein appears to have been used as an epithet for expressing highest degree of respect. The name of the Guru was Govindpad or probably Gobind only, 'pad' also being an epithet (or rather a suffix) as in Akshapada Uttanapada, Kalmashapada, Gaudapada etc. Acharya Gaudapada was the Guru of Govindapada. In 'Shankar Digvijaya[2] Govindapada has also been called Govindanath.

In sectarian works this lineage of Gurus has been traced not only upto Vyas, the author of Sutras (aphorisms), but as far back as Narayana the Creator. In the verses of 'Acharya—Stawa" (आचार्यस्तव)[3] this lineage is detailed thus : Shukdeva, the Guru of Gaudpada; Vyasa himself, the guru of Shukdeva, Parashara, the guru and father of Vyas; Shakti, the guru and father of Parashar; Vasishtha, the guru of Shakti; Brahma, the guru of Vasishtha; Narayana i.e. God himself, the guru of Brahma. The pre-Vyasa lineage has been discussed in this

1. The paragraph containing the name and other details about the author, usually appearing at the end of a chapter or book is called 'Pushpika.'
2. Sarga 5, Verse 105
3. Nārāyaṇam Padmabhavam Vasistham Shaktim Cha Tatputra Parāsharam cha. Vyasam Shukam Gaudapadam Mahantam Govindyōgindramathāsya Shishyam. Shri Shakaraçharyam. . . . . .

नारायणं पद्मभवं वसिष्ठं शक्तिञ्च तत्पुत्रपराशरं च।
व्यासं शुकं गौडपादं महान्तं गोविन्दयोगीन्द्रमथास्य शिष्यम्॥
श्रीशङ्कराचार्यम्········।

book under the head 'author of Brahma Sutra.[1]

From amongst Veda Vyasa to Shankaracharya, Veda Vyas and Shukadeva are father and son as well as teacher and pupil at the same time. According to available historical data they belonged to the age of the Mahabharata War. There is no dispute about it. The last three in this lineage are Gaudpada, Govindpada and Shankaracharya. Nobody questions this order in their lineage. Their historicity is also admitted by all. But Shukadeva, son of Vyasa, being the Guru of Gaudapada or Gaudapada being the disciple of Shukadeva calls for serious thought.

Shukadeva, Guru of Gaudapada

That Gaudpada etc. belonged to a period long after the Mahabharata war is definite. The intervening period is so long that nobody can be expected to live that much. The date of Shankar can be fixed somewhere between four hundred and fifty years before and at the most 8th century after the Vikram era. Giving premium for uncertainty, even if we accept the former (450 years before Vikram era) to minimise the gap, we are still left with nearly two thousand and five hundied years between the time of Shankar's grand Guru Gaudpad who lived a little before him and Shukdeva living at the time of the war of Mahabharata. That [Shukadeva lived for so long and was there to teach Gaudpada is an impossibility. According to the Mahabharata[2] Shukadeva had died while his father Vyasadev was still alive.

Sidhasareera[3] Of Shukadeva

The contention, in support of the lineage as found in the books of Vedantists, that Shukadev, the son of Vyas, manifesting himself in subtle body, taught Brahm Vidya to Gaudpadacharya like the great sage Kapil who similarly appearing in an assumed body (निर्मण काय) taught Shashtitantra (षष्टितन्त्र) to Asuri, is abso-

1. See page 44-47. Vedantadarshan ka Itihas, Adhyaya-2.
2. Shatiparva—Chap. 333.
3. Sidhasareera : a self-acquired body or form, for a short duration, by yaugik power or sidhi.

lutely baseless and without any historical background. Neither Kapil nor Shukadev, did like that. The medieval writers, by resorting to such baseless presumptions, have only made Indian literature look like books of fiction. No sane person is going to believe them. As a matter of fact the word (निर्मण काय) itself is not there in the aphorism[1] in the 'Panchshikh' which is said to be the source of this anecdote associated with Kapil. The Sutra contains the word (निर्मणचित). How this could be twisted to mean (निर्मणकाय) is beyond one's comprehension. The only meaning inherent in this word is that inspired by love for the people Kapil adopting a mental attitude conforming to his teachings, imparted knowledge of the Shastras to Asuri. Kapil and Asuri were present in physical form at the same time. That Kapil, like others, was born of his parents is clearly borne out by history handed down from generation to generation. Puranic literature gives an account of other members of his family.[2] Why should he then need a different form-a Sidhasareera for what he could do in the normal course. Then there is a gap of some thousands of years between the time of Shukadeva and that of Gaudpada.

Everybody knows that a soul without form has no name. The name 'Shukdeva' was given to the soul born of Vyasadev in human form. It is clearly stated in the Mahabharata[3] that the body of Shukdeva was disposed of while Vyas was still alive. How could anybody identify after nearly two-thousand and five hundred years that it is the same old Shukadeva now born without any parents to impart instruction to Guadpada ? It is well nigh impossible to analyse and determine that the soul of Shukdeva, at it was then called, after leaving the body known as Shukdeva never took birth again, waited and waited till a man called Gaudpada was born, then took to human from without any parents with attachment still with the form once known as Shukdeva and bearing the same old name once more taught Gaudpad. It is all a lengthly tale

1. Text of aphorism : आदिविद्वान्निर्मणचित्तमधिष्ठाय कारुण्याद् भगवान् परमर्षिरासुरये जिज्ञासमानाय तन्त्रं प्रोवाच ।
2. Shrimadbhagwat canto III, and Padma Purana, Uttara Khand 112-2, 3
3. Mahabharata Shantiparva Chap. 333.

of imaginations-nothing better than fairy tales, if they are taken as they are.

Shukdeva, Guru of Gaudapada

Going deeper, it can be said that we did not probably try to assess the sentiments of those who held that Shukadeva was the Guru of Gaudapada. The historicity of the lineage of Gurus from Shankar to Gaudapada is admitted by all. But those who described Shukadeva as Gaudapada's Guru had no matter-of-fact knowledge about the intervening period between Gaudapda and Shukadeva. No body knows it even today. But it was common knowledge then, as it is today, that the original exponent of the process of divine knowledge based on Vedant and presented by Gaudapada in his times was Vedavyasa who gave it to his son and pupil Shukadeva. This earlier part of the tradition is also historically as true as the later one.The khowledge inherited by Shukadeva from his father-cum-teacher Vedavyasa, was subsequently passed on to Gaudapada in his times after a very long interval. Due to ignorance about this order and the ideas of Shukadeva and Gaudapada as taught, preached and propagated, being similar or looked upon as such, the writers in the mediaeval period described Shukadeva as the Guru of Gauda pada. These writers were definite about the intial and final stages; they left out what was doubtful or unknown. They never meant to give a historical account of the order of Gurus. What they intended to do was to establish the authenticity of the concepts of Gaudapada which could be done by closely associating him with the original exponents. This is how this could be reasonably interpreted. Elsewhere[1] also we have similarly explained this teacher-pupil relationship in the case of 'Varshaganya (वार्षगण्य) and 'Vindhyavasa, (विन्ध्यवास). There is nothing incompatible here. May-be, the Acharyas in mediaeval times referred to the teacher-pupil relationship between these historical personages in this very sense which the writer of today did not care to understand.

1. See 'Sankhya Darshan Ka Itihas' by the author page 434-442.

Govindapada

That Shankar's Guru Gobindapada wrote any treatise on Vedant, is not known. There is no such thing either based on tradition or available in the texts. In the chapter, Raseshwardarshana, of Madhawacharya's 'Sarvadarshana Sagraha, we find mention of a book 'Rasahridaya' which is admittedly authentic. This is, however, a work on chemistry and Gobindbhagavatpada is its author. But it cannot be taken for granted that this same Gobindapada was Shankar's Guru.

No historical account of Shankar's guru, Gobindapada is available. But it is said that "he lived on the banks of the Narmada.[1] He was a great yogi and as it prevails amongst the Sadhakas (devotees given to spirituality), his body was sublimated through chemical process. Tradition also has it that, though he lived for a thousand years, his body showed no sign of senility. He always appeared to be sixteen years old. In fact it is imposible to have a historical account of Govindapada."

From this traditional account it can be inferred that Govindapada, living on the banks of the Narmada, was a great yogi. It is true that from amongst the various methods, prescribed in Patanjali's Yoga-Shastra for achieving Siddhi or supernatural powers, Govindapada resorted to the one known as 'chemical process' (रस प्रयोग) and achieved Sidhi.[2] This may be true of Govindapada, the author of 'Rasahridya Tantra'. Undoubtedly he must have been an experienced master of that science. It is however, not possible to acclaim the same person as Shankar's guru for the following reasons :

1. See Introduction, (page 20) to Hindi Shankar Bhashya by Dr. Gopinath Kaviraj, published as "Achyuta."

2. See aphorism 4/1 of Patanjali's Yog Darshan-its commentary by Vyasa and Tatva-Vaisharadi by Vachaspati (Vachaspatya). There is a mention of the body being made imperishable by the use of medicines and chemical processes. Vachaspti Mishra has said here that one Mandavya Muni, living in Vindhya, had achieved Siddhi through these means.

Govinda, the author of 'Rasahridayatantra, not Shankar's Guru

1. The philosophy of Shankar is not in accordance with the ideology of 'Rasahridayatantra', whose authenticity has been admitted in the chapter, Raseshwardarshan, in Sarvadarshan Sangraha by Madhavacharya. Anyone, not falling in line with the ideology of the trio of Gaudapada—Govindapada—Shankar cannot possibly be included in this trio of Acharyas. The works of Gaudapada and Shankar are there. Nobody can deny the similarity in their concepts as stated therein. A person who is not one with them cannot be with them. As such Govindapada, the author of 'Rasahridayatantra'; who emphasises therein the strengthening of the physical body to the maximum possible through chemical formulae, cannot be the Guru of a philosopher and spiritual leader like Shankaracharya.

2. The 15th Verse (Shloka) of 1st Chapter of Rasahridaya Tantra says—

स्थिरदेहोऽभ्यासवशात् प्राप्य ज्ञानं गुणाष्टकोपेतम् ।
प्राप्नोति ब्रह्मपदं पुनर्भवावासदु:खेन ।।

"One with a body made sound and stout through chemical ways, can, by practising meditation, know Brahma and, knowing Brahma, attain salvation. He is no longer involved in the process of rebirths." According to Shankar, however, perfection can be achieved through 'अहं ब्रह्मास्मि' (I am Brahm), meditation being superfluous. The means to achieve knowledge as enunciated in this verse are similar to those of Brahmdatta and others. As such Govind, the author of 'Rasahridya Tantra', could not be Shankar's Guru.

3. Govinda Bhikshu, author of 'Rasahridaya Tantra has, towards the end of his work, given his identity as follows-

शीतांशुवंशसंभवहैहयकुलजन्मजनितगुणमहिमा ।
स जयति श्रीमदनश्च किरातनाथो रसाचार्य : ।।७८।।
यस्य स्वयमवतीर्णा रसविद्या सकलमङ्गलाधारा ।
परमश्रेयसहेतुः श्रेयः परमेष्ठिनः पूर्वम् ।।७९।।
तस्मात् किरातनृपतेर्बहुमानमवाप्य रसकर्मनिरतः ।
रसहृदयाख्यं तन्त्रं विरचितवान् भिक्षुगोविन्दः ।।८०।।

May Shri Madan, master of Chemistry, king of the Kirats and possessed of qualities bestowed on account of birth in the Haihaya tribe, of Chandra dynasty, be victorious. The source of all bliss and supreme good, the science of Chemistry by which, in the first instance, Brahma obtained supreme happiness came to him of its own accord. Having been profusely honoured by that king of the Kirats, Bhikshu Govind, ever devoted to the science of Chemistry, wrote this book entitled 'Rashridaya Tantra.'

Shrimadan, the king of Kirats, might have belonged to the ruling hill dynasty of Nepal etc. This identity of Bhikshu Govind stands in the way of his being accepted as the Guru of Shankar. There is no evidence anywhere which may go to indicate the invlovement of Shankar's Guru Govindapada, in chemical experiments.

4. Dr. P.C. Ray, in his 'History of Hindu Chemistry', adds the following two verses after the last one quoted above.

नत्वा मङ्गलविष्णोः सुमनोविष्णोः सुतेन ग्रन्थोऽयम् ।
श्रीगोविन्देन कृतस्तथागतः श्रेयसे भूयात् ।।
अष्टादशसंस्कारं रसेन्द्रदेवस्य दिव्यतनु दृष्ट्वा ।
लिखितमिदं पुण्यतमं रसहृदयमवाप्यते सकलम् ।।

Shri P.C. Ray has called Govind Bhikshu a Buddhist on the basis of the last line of the first verse. The fact that the author has, in this verse, paid obeisance to Lord Vishnu. given his father's name as Sumanovishnu and mentioned Har, Hari etc. in the beginning of the book,[1] creates some doubt in his being a Buddhist. But his clear assertion of तथागतःश्रेयसेभूयात् confirms him as such. His adoration of Vishnu may be due to his liberal outlook towards Buddhist and Arya religions and cultures. Even Buddha was later accepted as an incarnation of Vishnu in the Puranic tradition. There is no doubt about the said tradition having taken roots long before Govind Bhikshu, the author of 'Rashridaya Tantra.' This position of the author of Rashridaya Tantra does make his being Shankar's Guru very doubtful.

1. See 'Rashridaya Tantra,' verses 2,7,14 etc.

Thousand year old body

That Govindapada's body, though a thousand year old, looked just sixteen year old is itself doubtful. This seems to have been highly exaggerated. The people are generally very anxious to coin such tales. Man is by nature, always influenced by miracles. It calls for thoughtful consideration that if a thousand year old body could look like that of sixteen years only, it could have certainly survived for another thousand or even two thousand years. Oh! a man of today would wish to have been fortunate enough to have seen him. Under the circumstances the only thing which could be said about Shankar's Guru, Govindapada, is that it is not possible to have any historical data about him.

Govindapada in 'Shankar Digvijaya'

The description of Govindpada as given by Madhvacharya in Canto 5 of his Shankar Digvijaya deserves consideration. The general tendency of medieval writers in India has been to elevate to the highest limit a person towards whom they were favourably inclined. The element of exaggeration was so much as to render finding of factual data impossible. The person so admired was either described as the spirit of some supreme Acharya of the past or directly connected with God, confeiing upon him incarnation of Shankar, Vishnu, Brahma and the like. Govindapada was no exception. Being the Guru of Shankar, how could he escape from being deified?

Madhvacharya has, in this context in Shankar Digvijaya, described Govindapada as the spirit of Sheshanaga and his own self in the form of Patanjali. Sheshanaga, with his body with a thousand hoods, used to teach Mahabhashya to his pupils with a thick curtain between them. The curtain removed one day, the pupils were frightened. Sheshanaga then started teaching in human form. That very Patanjali had descended as Govindpada.[1]

It was further stated that Govindapada was the pupil of Acharya Gaudapada and that Gaudapada received all spiritual knowledge from Shukadeva, the son of Vyas.[2]

1. Shankar Digvijaya by Madhvacharya 594-96.
2. Ibid 5-97.

How far this statement of Madhvacharya could be historically authenticated needs consideration. The very name of Patanjali is a controversial matter. We have discussed this point in our 'Sankhya Darshan Ka Itihas.'[1] Patanjali, the author of Mahabhashya, is said to be the Adi (first) Shesha or the incarnation of Sheshanag; in other words, Sheshnag appeared as Patanjali.

Patanjali, Sheshanag

Who was the Sheshnag or Adishesha? According to Puranic mythology he is the thousand hooded naga or serpent who sustained the earth on one of his hoods. Verily, he is the bracelet of Lord Shiva and the bed of Lord Vishnu. In that very form he taught Mahabhashya.

Could any sane person ever believe this story? But today, not to speak of ordinary people, even highly learned persons believe it as it is, without in any way applying their mind. As a matter of fact this has nothing to do with knowledge or ignorance. It is simply a matter of faith which is generally blind and which therefore, never feels the necessity of discriminating between truth, and falsehood or real and unreal. That is why such people could believe the possibility of mahabhashya being taught through the hood or hoods in a serpent like body. Could those specific and subtle parts by which the letters of the alphabet are pronounced through the mouth of human beings endowed with articulate speech, ever possibly exist in the body of a serpent? These people never think it necessary to apply their mind to these things. They do not even think how and by whom the earth was sustained when sheshnaga in the human form of Patanjali was engaged in teaching Mahabhashya.

Madhvacharya, in his 'Shankar Digvijaya'[2] has gone to the extent of saying that for studying Mahabhashya Govindpada approached Sheshnag in the form of Patanjali in the lower regions of the earth through a hole. There is no remedy for such superstitions.

Today every sane person knows that the earth is not sustained on the hood of a serpent. In the past also scholars were

1. Chap.8, pp. 512-23.
2. Canto 5, Verse 96.

not ignorant of this fact. It is, therefore, surprising that even the so called scholar of today still persists in this old belief-still harps on it. This is nothing but blind faith.

Who was this Sheshanaga or Adi Sheshanaga.

It may be inferred from the position of human society and its history that Adi Shesh or Sheshanaga was some person who should have been a leader of the famous Naga dynasty in ancient times. In available Indian literature he is described as 'Phanibhridbharta' or 'Ahipati.'[1] In Sanskrit literature the tradition at all times has been to use synonyms, not only for common words but also for proper names. In human society, Naga was a clan or tribe which is a part or branch of the Aryan family. For reasons not known this clan of Aryan family was named as such. In Sanskrit snake is also called Naga. In course of time the real and specific meaning was lost by this traditional use of synonyms, giving birth to a new complication. The leader of the Naga family, 'Shesha' was turned into an ordinary snake and a number of fairy tales concocted accordingly. The indiscreet people continue to be influenced by them even today.

Shesha, leader of the Nagas:-

Shesha or Adishesha was a human being like us. That the Nagas had their relations with the Aryan families for a sufficiently long time in ancient India is clearly mentioned in the Mahabharata[2] and other works of history. Like the Aryans these people were engaged in the study of the Vedas as also in the performance of the Yajnas (Sacrifices). This Shesha of the

1. See Yoga-Sutra,-Bhoja-Vritti, Verse 5. Also the first verse in the commentary of Charaka Samhita by Chakrapani. "मनोवाक्कायदोषाणां हन्त्रेऽहिपतये नमः"
2. Arjun was married to a Naga woman (M.B.Bhishma Parva. No. 90) Nahusha and Takshaka, sons of father Kashyapa and mother Kadru, were real brothers. (M.B. Adi Parva 355,9) Nahusha, the son of Ayu and Swarbhanu Kumari who was Yayati's father was a different person. (M.B Adi 1 229& 75 25)

Nagas must have been a highly learned scholar of Sanskrit grammar etc. A Sanskrit lexicon prepared by him has come to light.[1] This is an evidence of his deep knowledge of grammar etc.

Patanjali, incarnation of Shesha:

As stated above, scholars in later days were declared incarnations of earlier experts of similar subjects. Patanjali, author of Mahabhashya, having acquired expert knowledge of grammar etc. was probably recognised as the incarnation of Adi Shesha. It is not now possible to ascertain whether Patanjali himself belonged to the Nagas or the Aryans. More likely he belonged to the Aryans. His recognition as the incarnation of Sheshanaga is indicative of the cordial relationship between the Nagas and the Aryans in those days.

The epithet of 'Muni' has been often used with Patanjali in almost all the literature. Muni is a thinker—an independent thinker-and one who does not follow others but forges his own way. Patanjali was that type of a person.

Govindpada has been described as the incarnation of Patanajali. This must have been due to similarity in their qualities, scholarship etc. Otherwise, how could it be revealed that the soul of the very same Sheshanag took birth as Patanjali and Govindpada at different times; just as according to the belief of the people of Tibet, the soul of Buddha traditionally passes on into the bodies of Dalai Lamas. This is simply nonsense and is the result of ignorance based on blind faith.

Dialogue Between Govind and Shankar:

In Shankar Digvijaya[2] we find a reference of a dialogue between Govindpada and Shankar. Govindpada asked Shankar who he was. This is a common place and natural question put to a stranger by a local person. In reply Shankar should have ordinarily disclosed his identity and the purpose of his visit. But in the reply put into the mouth of Shankar by the author, the courtesy and politeness expected of a disciple towards his would-be pre-

1. Hundreds of sentences attributed to Shesha are given in the lexicon by Hemchandra.
2. Canto 5-98, 99.

ceptor are conspicuous by their absence. Instead there is a clear evidence of his disrespect for his Guru, impertinence and a sense of cajolary. Shankar said, "I am none of the earth, water, fire, air, ether or their property or even the organs. I am what is left behind the supreme reality, Lord Shiv."[1]

For the sake of argument it may be said that the Guru put the question with a view to testing the abilities of the pupil and the pupil replied accordingly. As a matter of fact both had known each other through meditation.

Such an explanation only shows that the person concerned is badly overcome by blind faith. Such a dialogue between a teacher and his pupil at the very outset is not to be seen anywhere in Indian culture. We come across one such dialogue between a teacher and his pupil in the beginning of the seventh chapter in Chhandogya Upanishad. Narad approached Guru Sanatkumar, saying that he had come to him for study. Guru Sanatkumar asked him to state what he had studied till then so that he could teach him further. Narad gave him details of the Vedas and other scriptures he had studied, stating politely at the same time that he had only superficial knowledge of all that. He had not realised the Supreme Self-the ultimate reality in quest of which he had come to him." Mark the vast difference between the two. Narad's reply is all politeness and humility.

The sum and substance of all this is only to show that Madhava's Shankar Digivijaya is not a work of history. At best it can be a beautiful piece of literature. A few ingredients of historical worth may, however, be sifted after very careful scrutiny. Certainly a cultured prospective pupil from a Vedic Brahaman family of Aryan culture could have never given the reply put into Shankar's mouth by the author. It is only the author s imagination which speaks of his deep reverence for Shankar and the latter's great influence on him.

From this account this much can be said about Govindpada that he had studied Grammar etc. from Sheshanang known as

1. स्वामिन्नहं न पृथिवी न जलं न तेजो, न स्पर्शनो न गगनं न च तद्गुणो वा। नापीन्द्रियाण्यपि तु विद्धि ततोऽवशिष्टो, यः केवलोऽस्ति परमः स शिवोऽहमस्मि ॥

Patanjali[1] and Vedant from Gaudapada. It may also be concluded that Govindpada, the renowned master of chemistry and author of Rasahridaya, was not the Guru of Shankar.

Shankar's Contrast with Govinda

If for argument's sake it may be granted that this Govindapada lived for a thousand years or even more it will still be very difficult to ascertain at what stage he came into contact with Shankar. Govindpada should have studied Vedanta etc. from Gaudapada in the earlier days of his life. Was Gaudapada still alive when Shankar came into contact with Govindpada ?[2]

Gaudapada In Shankar's Time

Whether Acharya Gaudapada was alive till the time of Shankar, also requires discussion. If he was alive, his age should also have exceeded one thoused years; in that case how did he manage to keep his body unmutilated—through some chemical process or therwise ? If not, a number of unknown Acharyas in the intervening period upto the so called time of Shankaracharya would have to be created to maintain continuity of tradition. With portions of Gaudpadiyakarika included in the works of Nagarjuna etc.[3] it is definte that the time of Gaudapada can not be fixed about the so called time (800-900 AD) of Shankar. This discussion is not futile. Without this it will not be possible to revise history.

1. Shankar Digvijaya, canto 5 verses 96, 105, 106.
2. That Gaudapada was not alive at the so called time (8th to 9th Century AD) of Shankar has been discussed in the lines to follow
3. ज्ञानेनाकाशकल्पेन धर्मान् यो गगनोपमान् ।
   ज्ञेयाभिन्नेन संबुद्धस्तं वन्दे द्विपदाम्वरम् ॥ (गौ.का ४/१)
   यः प्रतीत्यसमुत्पादं प्रपञ्चोपशमं शिवम् ।
   देशयागास संबुद्धस्तं वन्दे द्विपदाम्बरम् ॥ (नागार्जुनीय, मा.का. प्रा. भाग)
   स्वप्नमाये यथा दृष्टे गन्धर्वनगरं यथा ।
   तथा विश्वमिदं दृष्टं वेदान्तेषु विचक्षणैः ॥ (गौ.का २/३१)
   यथा माया यथा स्वप्नो गन्धर्वनगरं यथा ।
   तथोत्पादस्तथा स्थानं तथा भङ्ग उदाहृतम् ॥ (मा.का. ७-५७२)

Rajwade Katha

Dr. Gopi Nath Kaviraj says[1]---"According to a book named "Rajwade Katha", Jinasen, Gunabhadra and Shankar's Guru Govindapada were contemporaries. According to this book Gunabhadra was the pupil of Jinasen and Govindpada that of Gunabdadra. Bhattarak Govinda's son Hastimalla has in his drama 'Vikrantakaurava' eulogised the poet thus—Gunabhadra was Jinasen's pupil and Govind was the best of the lot of Gunabhadra's pupils. This Govinda was a different Acharya. There is no doubt about 'Harivansha' having been written by Jinsen in 705 Shaka era or 783 AD. We find from this book that these Acharyas were the court pandits of Bhoja, the King of Dhara. But this version cannot be authenticated because the famous Raja Bhoj flourished in the 11th Century AD. According to some this Bhoj was not the famous Raja Bhoja of Dhara but some one of the Gupta dynasty of Kanyakubja (See page 224 of the proceedings of third Oriental Conference). According to Prabhavakcharita, of Bappabhatti, Govinda and others were contemporaries. Raja Bhoja sent for Govinda after the death of Bappabhatti in 839 AD. Bappabhatti was born in 744 AD. That this Govinda was no ordinary scholar is borne out by the statement of Bappabhatti also. Bappabhatti has paid glowing tributes to the scholarship of Vakpati.

In this context we are concerned with only that part of the account which relates to Govindapada. In the book known as 'Rajawade Katha', Jinasen, Gunabhadra and Govindapada, the Guru of Shankaracharya have been described as contemporaries. The contention that Gunabhadra was the pupil of Jinasen and and Govindapada that of Gunabhadra has been supported by the eulogy given at the end of the drama, Vikranta kaurava; by Govindputra Hastimalla. The account given in Rajawade Katha tallies with that in the Vikrantakaurava. Who followed whom will be clear from the chronology.

The author of Vikrantakaurava is Govindaputra Hastimalla. Herein Hastimalla is the author while Govind is his father. Who this Govind is, is not clear from what has been stated by Dr. Kaviraj. This Govind may be identified as being the very same person who has been described in the drama as the pupil of

1. See 'Achyuta', foot note at page 20.

Gunabhabra, himself the pupil of Jinasen. If that be so his version about his father and his (father's) contemporary Acharyas will certainly be admitted as being authentic. It is thus clear that Gunabhadra was the Guru of the dramatist Hastimalla's father Govind and Jinasen, the Guru of Gunabhadra. All the three-young and old-can be contemporaries. The said drama was writtien in or about the time of these Acharyas. Rajwade Katha is decided by a composition of a later date. As such the account given in Rajwade Katha appears to have been based on the details given in the said drama.

A point arises here. Hastimalla, in his eulogy, has not described his father Govind as Shankaracharya's Guru. That is probably why Dr. Kaviraj, after quoting, in this context, from the said drama opined that this Govind was the name of a different Acharya. This only means that Hastimalla's father Govind and Shankar's Guru Govindapada were two different persons. What led the author of Rajawade Katha[1] to identify this Govind as Shankaracharya's Guru is not known.

According to ambiguous statements and indications relating to this Guru Govindapada in ancient works concerning Shankaracharya the name of Govindpada's Guru was Gaudapada or Patanjali, the Adi Shesha in human form. There is no mention anywhere of Gunabhadra being his Guru. Govind whose account is available in Prabhavakacharita has nowhere been described as the Guru of Shankaracharya. That Govind of Vikranta-kaurava and Prabhakacharita was not Shankaracharya's Guru is amply clear.

Gaudapada

That Acharya Gaudapada was the Guru of Govindpada is ascertained from the works of different schools. 'Acharyastava' and 'Shankar Digvijaya[2] both bear it out.

An important work of Acharya Gaudapada is the Mandukyakarika on Mandukyopanishad. This work, though not so

1. Despite best efforts this work could not be traced.
2. व्यासं शुकं गौडपादं महान्तं गोविन्दयोगीन्द्रमथास्य शिष्यम् —
Part of a verse of 'Acharyastava (Shankar Digvijaya, 597, 105)

voluminous, is superb in Vedantic literature for its theories and depth of meaning. The Upnishad of which this Karika is a commentary is by itself very small in volume, comprising only twelve Kandikas or mantras. Evenso it occupies an important place in the galaxy of eleven ancient and authentic Upanishadas. Acharya Gaudapad has written 215 Karikas, divided into four parts. The partwise number of the Karikas is as given below:

Agama	29
Vaitathya	38
Advaita	48
Alatashanti	100

Details of Mandukyakarika

The literal explanation of the twelve Kandikas of the Upanishad has been completed in the first chapter. Though very small in volume this Upanishad presents a scientific explanation of Om, the most important of the names of Supreme God. The greatness of this name is found in all the Upanishads.[1] The supreme subject matter of Vedant is Brahma. For realising Him, OM, the basic means for the purpose, is described in this Upanishad. Hence the significance of this Upanishad. That probably is why Gaudapada chose this upanishad for the exposition of his sentiments and convictions. This Karika of Gaudapada is the base for all the Vedantic theories, now known to scholars as Shankara Vedant.

The twelve Kandikas of the upanishad have been explained in quite unambiguous terms in the first part-Agama. The first six Kandikas of the Upanishad have been explained in nine Karikas of Gaudapada while the seventh Kandika alone

1. 'ओमित्येकाक्षरमुद्गीथमुपासीत' (छा. १।१।१), 'ओंकार एवेदं सर्वम्' (माण्डू. १), 'ओमिति ब्रह्म' (तै. १।८।१)
'सर्वे वेदा यत्पदमामनन्ति तपांसि सर्वाणि च यद्वदन्ति। यदिच्छन्तो ब्रह्मचर्यं चरन्ति तत्ते पदं संग्रहेण ब्रवीमि ओमित्येतत्।' (कठ. १।२।१५)
'प्रणवो धनुः शरो ह्यात्मा ब्रह्म तल्लक्ष्यमुच्यते'(-मुण्डक. २।२।४) तमोंकारे-'णैवायतनेनान्वेति'-(प्रश्न-५।७)

occupies the following nine Karikas. Thus as many as 18 Karikas have been devoted to explain the first 7 Kandikas. The next four- 8 to 11 - have been explained in 5 Karikas. The last 6 Karikas contain the explanation of the remaining 12 Kandikas. In this way all the 29 Karikas in the first part have been utilised to explain the 12 Kandikas of the Upanishad. The remaining three parts are devoted to establishing the theories which, the Acharya thought, were contained in the Upanishad itself.

The first part is called 'Agama'. This contains an exposition of the Kandikas of the original upanishada. Herein is determined the concept of Omkar, the prime means for the realisation of self. The second part is captioned 'Vaitathya.' Just as one recognises the rope as such after getting rid of illusion due to imposition of snake, he discovers Advait or monism after destruction of duality. This second part is an attempt at arguing against the points in support of dualism. The very same process adopted for falsifying duality is equally applicable in the case of Advaita or monism. The third part known as 'Advait' aims at logically establishing the reality of the concept of Advait. In the fourth part 'Alatashanti' are refuted other concepts opposed to Advait.

While Acharya Shankar has everywhere given details of Acharya Gaudapada, in his works, he has not even given an indication of his Guru's name. No specific reason can be assigned for that. But that he had no Guru is not possible.

Dravid, not a school or sect :—

Some modern scholars[1] even doubt Gaudapada's being a historical figure. Sureshwaracharya in his work 'Naishkarmya-siddhi' (नैषकर्म्यसिद्धि) (4=41-44) quoting from some of the Karikas[2] of Gaudapada and a verse from the 'Upadeshasahasri'

1. See अच्युत footnote on page 21, 22.
2. The following 11th and 15th Karikas from Agama part of Gaudapada Karika have been quoted—
कार्यकारणबद्धौ ताविष्येते विश्वतैजसौ।
प्राज्ञः कारणबद्धस्तु द्वौ तौ तुर्ये न सिद्ध्यतः ॥११॥
अन्यथा गृह्णतः स्वप्नो निद्रा तत्त्वमजानतः।
विपर्यासे तयोः क्षीणे तुरीयं पदमश्नुते ॥१५॥

of Acharya Shankar, says[1]---'एवं गौडैद्राविडैर्नः पूज्यैरर्थः प्रकाशितः'—thus did our revered Gauda and Dravida Acharyas interpret it. Sureshwaracharya quoted from ancient authorities in support of his own contentions.

But the so called modern critics, taking नः of the possessive case as 'न' denoting negation, interpreted 'द्राविडैर्नं' as 'not acceptable to the Dravids.' Following that interpretation, 'गौडै' was taken to mean 'acceptable to Gauda i.e. Gaudas or those belonging to gauda school.' What they want to arrive at is that when in 'द्राविडैर्नं' Dravid' stands for some Dravid sect, in 'गौडै' Gauda' must also stand for some Gauda or Gaudapada sect.

Obviously, this is an irony of the system of criticism followed by critics influenced by modern western thinking. Sureshwaracharya is very clear in mentioning Gaudapadacharya and Shankaracharya through गौडै: and द्राविडै:' respectively and showing his reverence for them. These very Acharyas have been quoted. No sect is intended to be indicated here. These two words stand for two particular individuals from whose works references have been taken. As such, there can be no doubt about Gaudapada being a historical figure.

Other Works of Gaudapada

Gaudapada's commentaries on Ishwar Krishna's 'Sankhya Karika' and 'Uttargita'[2] are also available. But that this Gaudapada is different from Gaudapada, the author of Mandukya Karika, is an acomplished fact on several counts. We have tried to prove it elsewhere[1] as far as possible. Whether the author of the commentaries of the 'Sankhyakarika' and 'Uttargita' is one and the same person or they are two different persons cannot be ascertained. This is not either the proper occasion for it.

1. The following verse from Upadeshsahasri of Shankaracharya has been quoted--

   सुषुप्ताख्यं तमोज्ञानं बीजं स्वप्नप्रबोधयोः ।
   आत्मबोधं प्रदग्धं स्याद् बीजं दग्धं यथाभवम् ।। १७-२६ ।

2. According to some scholars, the introductory part (Ch. 16-29) of 'Anugita' in the 'Ashwamedh Parva' of the Mahabharata is called Uttaragita. Some of the latter chapters are known as Brahaman Gita. Thereafter upto chapter 91 is the Anugita but Lokmanya B. G. Tilk has at page 321 of his Gita Rahasya (6th edition of 1928, Ch. संन्यास और कर्मयोग) quoted the following verse from Uttaragita.

   ज्ञानामृतेन तृप्तस्य कृतकृत्यस्य योगिनः ।
   न चास्ति किञ्चित्कर्त्तव्यमस्ति चेन्न स तत्त्ववित् ।। (Continued)

Gaudapada The Pupil of Patanjali

We have just stated above that Acharya Gaudapada has nowhere in his works given even an indication of the name of his Guru. But medieval writers have given some facts on the basis of which Dr. Gopi Nath Kaviraj has made some observations.

"RAMBAHADRA DIKSHIT"[2] in his Patanjalicharita says 'Acharya Gaudapada was the pupil of Patanjali, the commentator. It is said that Patanjali used to teach Mahabhashya to a number of students from behind the curtain. One day the students, out of curiosity, peeped through a hole in the curtain and discovered that Adishesha himself was present there with his thousand hoods and tongues. Enraged by this conduct of his pupils, Patanjali in the form of Shehsa burnt all of them with the fire thus emanating from him. One of his pupils had gone out before this episode. He came in and begged to be excused. This was Gaudapada. Patanjali cursed him, saying that he will become a Brahma Rakshasa but soon added that as and when he got a suitable pupil he would be relieved of the curse. Henceforth this pupil as Brahma-Rakshasa would ask everybody he came across to tell him the Nishtha form of the the root' 'पच्'. Everybody would say 'पचितम्'. None could tell the correct form 'पक्वम्'. The Brahma Rakshasa would immediately devour anybody who gave a wrong answer. It was after a long time that

This verse is nowhere to be found in the said context. Lokmanya Tilak has given a footnote on the same page saying that Shankar's commentary on Vedanta Sutras does not contain this verse. But the Acharya has quoted it in his commentary on Sanatsujatiya (सनत्सुजातीय) adding that the verse is from Lingapurana."

1. Sankhya Darshan Ka Itihasa (सांख्यदर्शन का इतिहास) Ref. Gaudapada page 405-06
2. See Achyut, pp. 22

he met one who gave him the correct answer. This was a Brahman from Ujjain, named Chandra.

On the basis of this reference, the following conclusions are arrived at—

1. That Gaudapada was the pupil of Patanjali of Mahabhashya fame.
2. That Patanjali used to teach from behind the curtain.
3. That his pupils out of curiosity, peeping through a hole, one day discovered Patanjali in the form of Adi Sheshanag.
4. That they were then burnt by the wrath of Patanjali.
5. That Gaudapada, the lone survivor because of his having gone out earlier, was cursed with becoming Brahm Rakshasa when he begged, on behalf of his fellow pupils, to be excused.
6. That he was to be relieved of the curse when he met an able pupil.

No. 2 and 5 hereabove is all imagination. That Patanjali was a serpent with a thousand hoods is absolutely false and absurd. We have earlier discussed this point in all its details. It is difficult to say what led to this story to be concocted. May-be this arose from a desire to depict the wrathful nature of Patanjali. May-be also that as a reaction to his extremely strict behaviour towards his pupils he was represented by a snake hissing with a thousand tongues, Whatever the truth, one thing is certain that Patanjali was very much a human being like others. His description as a serpent is only fabulous.

The element of truth in the story of Patanjali:

There may be something else to rationalise the story about Patanjali. The credit for elevating Panini's grammar with his commentary of Mahabhashya goes to Patanjali, who in his own times devoted all his life for spreading and propagating it. It seems that later on the study and teaching of Mahabhashya discontinued and in due course virtually disappeared. This very situation might have been allegorically described by a poet by telling that the pupils of Patanjali were burnt. Later on, in collaboration with one Acharya Gaudapada, Chandra, a Brahman from Ujjain, obtained Mahabhashya and revived its study and teaching thereby saving it from extinction. Perhaps this was Gaudapada who was relieved of the curse. All these sequences served for the plot of the interesting story thus made out.

According to Rajatarangini[1] this Chandracharya went to Kashmir with a copy of Mahabhasya and approached Maharaja Abhimanyu with whose help he made necessary arrangements for its study and teaching. Chandrachārya must have travelled for the purpose in other parts of the country also. Kashmir due to royal patronage, got mentioned in Rajatarangini. Bhartrihari has given an account of Chandra-charya's propaganda of Mahabhashya in his work Vakyapadiya[2] (वाक्यपदीय). Patanjali's being in serpent form is thus a mere myth.

Gaudapada's Guru Patanjali

That Patanjali, the grammarian of Mahabhashya fame, was the guru of Acharya Gaudapada appears to be a historical fact as stated at No. 1 above. It is also clear from this that Gaudapada never learnt anything from Shukadeva, the son of Vyas, nor could it be possible. Gaudapada appears to have been connected with Shukadev because he propagated the very doctrines of Vedant which were earlier introduced by Vyas and his son in their own times. That this was done to give credibility to his views has already been discussed. Another link was thus added to the existing chain of Gurus, with Patanjali as the Guru of Gaudapada. Further examination, is however, necessary before admitting it as a historical fact.

With the conclusion arrived at No. 6 above on the basis of the above quoted extract from Patanjalicharita, one thing is historically established that Acharya Gaudapada's intelligent and sagacious pupil was a Brahman from Ujjain, named Chandra. Gaudapada taught him Mahabhashya completely. Chandra

---

1. चन्द्राचार्यादिभिर्लब्ध्वादेशं यस्मात्तदागमम् ।
प्रवर्त्तितं महाभाष्यं स्वं च व्याकरणं कृतम् ॥१-१७६॥

2. पर्वतादागमं लब्ध्वा भाष्यबीजानुसारिभिः ।
स नीतो बहुशाखत्वं चन्द्राचार्यादिभि : पुनः ॥२-४८६॥
Pandit Yudhishthir Mimansak has elaborated this point in his "Sanskrit Vyakaran Sastra ka Itihas,"See part I, second edition, p. 348-29.

put it in writing and, as stated above, gave new life to it by organising it's study and teaching in Kashmir and other parts of India.

One thing which, in the interest of historical research, calls for proper investigation is whether Chandracharya who went to Kashmir for the propagation of Mahabhashya in the times of Maharaja Abhimanyu was the same Chandra whom, according to Patanjalichrita, Gaudapada had taught Mahabhashya or was it some different Chandracharya. Without discussion on this point, a number of problems may arise.

Four Marriages of Chandracharya

The gist of the account of Gaudapada and Govinda as given in Gaudapadollasa (गौडपादोल्लास) by Acharya Atmabodha is as follows:-

"Chandracharya married four girls - one each from those belonging to the Brahmanas, the Kshatriyas, the Vaishyas and the Shudras. Four sons were born from these four. They were named Vararuchi (वररुचि), Vikram (विक्रम) Bhatti (भट्टि) and Bhartrihari (भर्तृहरि). Of these Bhartrihari proved very intelligent. Chandracharya taught him Mahabhashya. Bhartrihari became a great grammarian. Gaudapada practised Yoga in the Himalayas. He initiated Chandracharya into Sanyas, giving him the name of Govind. This very Govind was the Guru of Shankaracharya. Govind, after becoming a Sanyasi, lived with his son Bhartrihari on the banks of the Narmada. Shankaracharya had gone to him for being intiated into Sanyas."[1]

It is yet difficult to ascertain the fact of Chandracharya's four marriages with the girls of four Varnas. But it becomes quite clear from this extract that Chandracharya as Sanyasi bore the name of Govindapada. This very person is the Guru of Shankaracharya.

---

1. Our reference here is based on the contents at page 23 of 'Achyut' by Dr. Gopinath Kaviraj who says that he has based his findings on Gaudapadollasa by Atmabodha. The source of his (Kavirāj) information is indicated by him in the footnote as "See page 25 of Shankaracharya by N. Venkataraman.' We could not secure 'गौडपादोल्लास' inspite of our best efforts.

Chandracharya and Bhartrihari

Bhartrihari's relation with Chandracharya calls for special attention. This Bhartrihari is probably the man who wrote Vakyapadiya (वाक्यपदीय) and other works. The first thing made clear here is that Bhartrihari possibly lived before the times of Vikrama who introduced the Vikram era. This is because Skandaswami, the Guru of Hariswami, incharge of the ecclesiastical department of Vikrama has in his works made a reference to Bhartrihari's Vakyapadiya.[1] Bhartrihari's father was the above mentioned Chandracharya, called Govindapada as Sanyasi. If this account is accepted as true, Shankracharya's lineage of Guru goes into the times before the advent of Vikram era. This should also be carefully sifted.

Chandracharya Not The Guru of Shankar—

In case Shankar's Guru Govindapada was the same Chandracharya who had gone to Kashmir for propagating Mahabhasya in the times of Maharaja Abhimanyu, Shankar's chain of Gurus shall have to be dated several centuries before the beginn ing of the Vakram era. Abhimanyu according to Rajatarangini, ruled somewhere near 1200 BC. If that were the time of Chandracharya (later Govind) it could be 700 years before the earliest date that could be ascribed to Shankaracharya. The trio of Acharyas-Gaudapada, Govind and Shankar, has to be kept inter-related in the sequence of time. The gap in the time of each one of them could not be wide. Being related as teacher and pupil they must have been almost contemporaries. It is impossible to maintain that Gaudapada and his pupil Govind flourished in the 12th Century BC while Shankar, the direct pupil of Govind, belonged to the 5th century BC.

The solution of this problem lies in acknowledging that Patanjali, the author of Mahabhashya, who on the basis of Patanjalicharit, Gaudapadollas, or any other historical sources is said to be the Guru of Gaudapada was not his direct Guru. He should be taken as being an indication of a Guru belonging to the particular school of Patanjali. The assumption of Gaudapada's absence at the time of burning of Patanjali's pupil lends credibility to it. The study and teaching of Mahabhashya became

---

1. Commentary on Nirukta by Skandaswami, 1/2, and 5/16.

almost extinct after Patanjali. In course of time Gaudapada came into contact with Patanjali's work. He got it propagated through his pupil Chandracharya. If they be accepted as contemporaries then the revival of Mahabhashya by Patanjali's direct pupil Gaudapada and the latter's pupil Chandracharya cannot be reconciled, By accepting Chandracharya as a contemporary of Abhimanyu he cannot be Shankar's Guru Govind. No other Chandıacharya being traceable in history, he can be recognised as the man who propagated Mahabhashya in Kashmir but that the same Chandracharya was Shankar's Guru cannot be possible.

Chandracharya's Guru Gaudapada Not Shankar's Grand Guru

It is clear from all this that Chandracharya, the exponent of Mahabhashya, and his Guru Gaudapada were historically of much earlier times than Shankar. Shankar's grand guru Gaudapada was a different person from the earlier Gaudapada. In my opinion the conception of Chandracharya's initiation into Sanyas and his being named Govindapada was the result of similarity in the name of his Guru Gaudapada. Chandracharya received royal patronage and his Guru was some scholar named Gaudapada. In course of time, due to the glamour of royal patronage the guru's name also got into prominence. Shankar's grand guru bore the same name. It was therefore presumed, that the same Gaudapada should have been Shankar's grand guru. Consequently his prominent pupil Chandracharya was supposed to have been initiated into Sanyas and named Govind. As a matter of fact no evidence is available for Chandrachraya's having been initiated into Sanyas. The man who, after initiation into Sanyas was named Govind and who became Shankar's guru was a different Brahman Chandra Sharma from Ujjain, who flourished several centuries after Chandracharya, the preacher of Mahabhashya. A contemporary of Maharaja Abhimanyu of Kashmir could never be the preceptor of Acharya Shankar.

The Three Gauaapadas

We have, thus, three presons named Gaudapada :

1. Gaudapada, the sectarian pupil of Patanjali, the author of Mahabhashya-the one who, with the co-operation of his favourite pupil Chandracharya, did praiseworthy work for the revival of Mahabhasya long after Patanjali's times.[1]

2. Acharya Shankar's grand guru Gaudapada who wrote Mandukyakarika on Mandukya Upanishad.

3. Gaudapada, the commentator of Sankhyakarika of Ishwara Krishna. This commentary on the Karikas is known as Gaudapadabhashya.

Chandracharya's Four Marriages, A Myth

The account of Gaudapada's pupil Chandrachrya's marrying four girls of the four Varnas and having a son from each of them named Vararuchi, Vikrama, Bhatti and Bhartrihari respectively, as given in Gaudapadollas, seems to be all imagination, without any base whatsoever. History is not wanting in throwing sufficient light on all these four persons. They were scholars flourishing at different times. It appears that, like Ballala Pandita, the author of Bhojaprabandha, who put a number of poets of different times together in the court of Bhoja, Atmabodha, the author of Gaudapadollas, put together these four persons belonging to different ages as sons of Chandracharya. To a man with critical mind there is not an iota of historicity in it.

Patanjali not a contemporary of Pushyamitra of Shunga Dynasty:

If, according to Rajatarangini, the description of Maharaja

1. Patanjali did not belong to the second century BC as generally believed. Indian chronology places the beginning of the Shunga dynasty at 1200 BC. Pushyamitra was the founder of this dynasty. According to some references in the Mahabhashya (इह पुष्यमित्र याजयाम etc.) Patanjali is said to be a contemporary of Pushymitra. But, as a matter of fact, these are ordinary references, without an indication of any particular incidence. We have in Mahabhashya, side side by side with the said sentence इह अधीमहे. Should it then be taken to mean that on the occasion of the yajna Patanjali was just a student in Pataliputra. Patanjali cannot be linked with Pushyamitra on the basis of such-like references. Patanjali has to be assigned to a period several centuries before this time.

Abhimanyu and Chandracharya being contemporaries, be given any historical significance and admitted as a fact, then another event of history calls for our attention. This is an admitted fact that Raja Abhimanyu's contemporary Chandracharya revived Mahabhashya obtained by him through his guru, Gaudapada. According to Rajtarangini Abhimanyu belonged to 12th century BC. According to Indian version available in the Puranas the Shunga dynasty came into being 1218 BC.[1] The ten rulers of this dynasty reigned for 300 years. Pushyamitra was the first amongst them. If Patanjali were a contemporary of Pushymitra the question of the revival of Mahabhashya by Chandracharya, another contemporary of Abhimanyu in 1200 BC., could not arise.

According to the aforesaid calculation, the reign of Shung dynasty began about 35-36 years before the reign of Abhimanyu came to an end.[2] How then could it be maintained that the work of a contemporary of Pushyamitra should disappear and had to be revived in the days of Abhimanyu.

The beginning of the reign of Shung dynasty almost coincides with that of Abhimanyu. According to the aforesaid calculation they were contemporaries, though at different states. To reconcile all these it is necessary, therefore, to grasp the real meaning of usages like इह पुष्यमित्रं याजयाम in the Mahabhashya. And the only way of doing this is to take them as ordinary usages like Devadatta, Yajnadatta, Vishvamitra etc. and not as some thing referring to any particular events. Thus Patanjali should be considered as belonging to a time several centuries before Abhimanyu and Pushyamitra. From all this discussion it is clear that Acharya Shankar's guru. Govindapada, was in no way connected with Chandracharya. No other sources for Govindapada's life history are available. Whatever little is known of him is based on Acharya Shankar himself.

1. See Ancient Hindu History (page 140) by Pandit Kota Venkatachala Pakayaji.
2. According to the chronology given in Rajatarangini, Abhimanyu's reign came to an end in 1182 BC.

Chapter 2

THE DATE OF ACHARYA SHANKARA

Modern historians are not unanimous about the age of Shankar. Western christian writers of today tried to question the authenticity of the statement made by medieval Acharyas in their works. A number of Indian writers also, situated as they were, have blindly followed them. It is needless to refer to those ancient writers, who in their works, gave no indication whatsoever of their own time or that of their works.

Shankar The Great:

Acharya Shankar was a great man of our country—one who, by his unique learning and spiritual attainment, changed the course of thinking of Indian scholars. Today, not only the scholars of India, but those of the whole world bow their heads before his scholarship, way of thinking and his theories. But the pity is that we have not been able to decide upon the date of birth of this great intellectual giant. As a matter of fact we have done more towards creating or magnifying doubts rather than resolving them. When several alternatives were given, later writers considered it safe to just enumerate them. Very little was done by way of sorting them out and digging deep to ascertain the fact. Whatever little was done in this direction did not receive due attention of those who posed themselves as authorities in such matters. They were content with the baseless and false utterances of western Christian scholars. And these are the people who today control the media of publicity.

Attempts For Shankar's Biography:

A tendency for writing about the life of Shankar has per-

sisted amongst scholars from the very beginning. It is said that Shankar's disciple Padamapada gave a detailed account of his 'digvijaya' (all round victory) in his work Vijayayadindima (विजयडिण्डिम). But unfortunately this work is not available today. A number of works[1] by later scholars are known to have been written on the subject but not more then 2-4 are available in print. A lot of material in the form of records of Maths, biographical works and miscellaneous entries in other literary works is available on the subject.

1. The following books on the subject are known so far—

	Name of the Book	*Author's Name*
1.	Shankar Vijaya	Anand Giri (pub. Calcutta)
2	"	Chidvilasa Yati (pub. in Granthakshara).
3.	"	Vyasagiri
4.	"	Sadanand
5.	"	Madhava (Anandashram Poona and Shrawananath Mandir, Hardwar).
6.	Acharyacharita (Kerala)	
7.	Shankarabhyudaya	Rajachudamani Dikshit (Pub. Shri Vanivilasa Press, Shrirangam)
8.	Shankarvijayavilasa Kavya	Shankara Deshikendra.
9.	Shankar vijaya Katha	
10.	Shankaracharya charita.	
11.	Shankaracharyavatara Katha	Anandatirtha
12.	Shankarvilasachampu	Jagannath
13.	Shankarabhyudaya Kavya	Ramakrishna
14	Shankardigvijayasara	Vrajaraja.
15.	Prachin Shankar Vijaya	Mookashankar (18th Acharya of Kamakoti peeth).
16.	Brihat Shankar Vijaya	Sarvajna Chitsukh.
17.	Shankaracharyotpatti.	
18.	Guruvansh Kavya	Lakshmanacharya (Pub. Shrirangam)
19.	Shankarmandara-saurabha.	Neelkantha Bhatta

But no serious efforts were ever made for its proper utilisation in ascertaining the age of Shankar. This strennous task should be undertaken by research institutes with ample resources.

The material preserved in the Maths established by the Acharya should be of special significance in ascertaining the age of Shankar. Most of the material in the Maths must have been maintained in its proper sequence. The possiblity of its being motivated otherwise should be very little. If it be found otherwise anywhere it could be easily reconciled with the help of other authenticated material. It would be useful to first reproduce the material preserved in the Maths. This will help in judging and reconciling other material available.

The Order of Maths of The Acharya

An up-to-date list of Shankaracharyas alongwith the period during which they served as chiefs is available in each of the Maths. The details about the very first Acharya Shankar, according to the chronology of Sharadapeetha, are as follows—

Birth—Vaishakh Shukla Panchami 2631 Yudhishthir era

Upanayana (thread wearing ceremony)—Chaitra Shukla Navami 2636 Y.E.

Sanyas (Renunciation)—Kartik Shukla Ekadashi, 2639 Y.E.

Education (Under Govindapada) upto Phalgun Shukla Dvitiya 2640 Y.E

Writing of commentaries etc. (at Badrikashrama)—upto Jyeshtha Badi Amavasya, 2646 Y.E.

Establishing Jyotirmatha—During the said period.

Debate with Mandanamishra Margashirsha Badi tritiya 2647 Y.E

(This debate continued for several months.)

Establishing Sharada Math. Kartik Badi Trayodashi 2648 Y E.

Establishing Shringeri Math. Phalgun Shukla Navami, 2648 Y.E

Initiation of Mandana into Sanyas (named Sureshwaracharya) Chaitra Shukla Navami, 2649.

Contact with Raja Sudhanva Margashirsha Shukla Dashami, 2649.

Pontificating Sureswaracharya at Sharada Peetham, Magha Sukla Saptami, 2649.

Beginning of Digvijaya (all round victory) Vaishakh Shukla tritiya, 2650.

Other activities during Digvijaya

Coming of Trotaka—Shravana Shukla Saptami 2653.

Coming of Hastamalaka—Ashwin Shukla Ekadashi 2654.

Trotaka's in Jyothirmatha }
Hastamalak's in Shringeri } Indication of their Pontification Pausha Shukla Puranmashi 2654.

Establishing Govardhan Matha Vaishakh Shukla Dashmi 2655.

Pontification of Padmapada there ,, ,, ,, 2655.

Digvijaya activities	Bhadra Paurnamashi 2655 to
stay at Sharadapeetha	Pausha Amavasya 2662
Death	Kartik Paurnamashi 2663

Shankar : Birth And Span of Life

According to these details, Shankar lived for 32 Years 6 months and 10 days. Shankar is said to have been born in 2631 Y E. Yudhisthir era commenced 38 years before Kali era, with the coronation of Yudhisthir. Yudhishthir ruled for 36 years and Kali era commenced 2 year thereafter. Thus Shankar was born in 509 BC[1] and died in 477 BC (509—32=477).

The Acharya of Sharadapeeth

From the genealogy of Sharadapeeth it is clear that the Acharya first established Jyotirmatha, thereafter the Sharada math, followed by Shringeri and last of all the Govardhan peeth. Acharya Shankar appointed Sureshwaracharya as head of Sharada peeth in 2649 Y.E. This comes to 491 BC. From Sureshwaracharya to Shri Abhinava Sachhidananda Tirtha, the present acharya, Sharadapeeth has had 77 Acharyas in all. As per the genealogy

1. Kali era commenced 3102 years BC (18th Febuary). By adding 38 years to it the Yudhishthir era goes back 3140 year BC. If we subtract from it 2631, years of Shankar's birth, we arrive at (3140-2631=509) 509 BC, being Shankar's date of birth.

their names as well as the period of their headship are given below ;---

S. No	Name of the Acharya	Yudhisthir Era	Period	Christian Era
1.	Brahmaswarupa (Sureshwara)	2649-2691	42 years	491-449 BC
2.	Chinsukha	upto 2715	24 ,,	449-425
3.	Sarwajnyana	,, 2774	59 ,,	425-366
4.	Brahmanandatirtha	,, 2823	49 ,,	366-317
5.	Swarupabhijnan	,, 2890	67 ,,	317-250
6.	Mangalmurti	,, 2942	52 ,,	250-198
7.	Bhaskara	,, 2965	23 ,,	198-175
8.	Prajnana	,, 3008	43 ,,	175-132
9	Bramhajyotsna	,, 3040	32 ,,	132-100
		Vikram		
10.	Anandawirbhava	,, Era 9	52	100-48
11.	Kalanidhitirtha	,, 82	73 ,,	48 BC to 25 AD
12.	Chidvilasa	,, 119	37 ,,	25-62 AD
13.	Vibhutyanand	,, 154	35 ,,	62-97
14.	Sphurtinilayapada	,, 203	49 ,,	97-146
15.	Varatantupada	,, 259	56 ,,	146-202
16.	Yogarudha	,, 360	101 ,,	202-303
17.	Vijayadindima	,, 394	34 ,,	303-337
18.	Vidyatirtha	,, 437	43 ,,	337-380
19	Chichhaktidaishika	,, 483	46 ,,	380-426
20	Vijnyaneshwaratirtha	,, 511	28 ,,	426-454
21.	Ritambhara	,, 572	61 ,,	454-515
22.	Amareshwaraguru	,, 608	36 ,,	515-551
23.	Sarwatomukhtirtha	,, 669	61 ,,	551-612
24.	Anandaishika	,, 721	52 ,,	612-664
25.	Samadhirasika	,, 799	78 ,,	664-742
26.	Narainashrama	,, 836	37 ,,	742-779
27.	Baikunthashrama	,, 885	49 ,,	779-828
28.	Vikramashrama	,, 911	26 ,,	828-854
29.	Nrisinhashrama	,, 960	49 ,,	854-903
30.	Trayambakashram	,, 965	5 ,,	903-908
31.	Vishnavashrama	,, 1001	36 ,,	908-994

32.	Keshavashrma	„	1060	59	„	944-1003
33.	Chidambarashram	„	1083	23	„	1003-1026
34.	Padmanabhashrama	„	1109	26	„	1026-1052
35.	Mahadevashrama	„	1184	71	„	1052-1127
36	Sachhidanandashram	„	1207	23		1127-1150
37.	Vidyashankarashram	„	1265	58		1150-1208
38.	Abhinavasachhidanand-ashrama	„	1293	28		1208-1236
39.	Shashishekharashram	„	1326	33		1236-1269
40.	Vasudevashrama	„	1362	36		1269-1305
41.	Purushottamashram	„	1394	32		1305-1337
42.	Janardanashrama	„	1408	14		1337-1351
43.	Hariharashrama	„	1411	3		1351-1354
44.	Bhavashrama	„	1421	10		1354-1364
45.	Brahmashrama	„	1436	15		1364-1379
46.	Vamanashrama	„	1453	17		1379-1396
47.	Sarajnashrama	„	1489	36		1396-1432
48.	Pradyumnashram	„	1495	6		1432-1438
49.	Govindashrama	„	1523	28		1438-1466
50.	Chidashrama	„	1576	53		1466-1519
51.	Vishveshwarashrama	„	1608	32		1519-1551
52.	Damodarashrama	„	1615	7		1551-1558
53.	Mahadevashrama (2)		1616	1		1558-1559
54.	Aniruddhashrama	„	1625	9		1559-1568
55.	Achyutashrama	„	1629	4		1568-1572
56.	Madhavashrama	„	1665	36		1572-1608
57.	Anantashrama	„	1716	51		1608-1659
58.	Vishwarupashrama	„	1721	5		1659-1664
59.	Chidghanasharma	„	1726	5		1664-1669
60.	Nrisinhashrama	„	1735	9		1669-1678
61.	Manoharashrama	„	1761	26		1678-1704
62.	Prakashanand Saraswati	„	1795	34		1704-1738
63.	Vishuddhashrama	„	1799	4		1738-1742
64.	Vamanendrashrama	„	1831	32		1742-1774
65.	Keshavashrama	„	1831	7		1774-1781
66.	Madhusudanashrama	„	1848	10		1781-1791
67.	Hayagrivashrama	„	1862	14		1791-1805
68.	Prakashashrama	„	1863	1		1805-1806
69.	Hayagrivanand Saraswati	„	1874	11		1806-1817
70.	Shridharashramā	„	1914	40		1817-1857

71.	Damodrashrama	„	1928	14	1857:1871
72.	Keshawashrama	„	1935	7	1871-1878
73.	Rajrajeshwar Shankar-ashrama	„	1957	22	1878-1900
74.	Madhavatirtha	„	1972	15	1900-1915
75.	Shantyanand Saras-wati[1]	„	1982	10	1915-1925
76.	Chandrashekhrashrama	„	2002	20	1925-1945
77.	Abhinavasachhid-anand Tirtha	Present Acharya			1945-

The Time of Establishment of Mathas

According to this chronogical order of Sharadapeeth the date of birth of Acharya Shankar is fixed at 509 BC. The dates of establishment of the four Mathas established by him is as follows—

Jyotirmatha— Somewhere during— 2641-2645 Y.E. – About 497 BC
Sharadamatha—Kartika 2648 Y.E. 492 „
Shringeri Matha-Phalgun 2648 „ „
Govardhana Matha— 2655 „ 485 „

Kanchi-Kamakoti Peetha

There is no mention of the Kama·Koti Peetha of Kanchi in the lineage of Sharadapeetha. A number of Mathas in the name of the founder Acharya were established in the later days. But the Kanchi Kamakoti Peeth is almost as old as the other main Mathas.

According to the records preserved in that Matha, the same was established in 2620 Kali era, i.e. 482 BC.

Acharya Shankar lived for 5-6 years after that. Sureshwaracharya presided over Kanchi Kamakoti Peetha for 70 years there-

1. The author has had personal contact with these 3 Acharyas of Sarada Peeth The present Acharya (No. 77) is very kind to him. It often happens that on the demise of an Acharya his successor is not installed immediately. The headship remains vacant for a year or two or even more after which a successor is installed. We have included this intervening period in the duration of the subsequent Acharya.

after. During his lifetime Shankaracharya appointed Sureshwar-achrya as head of the Sharada Peetha. Instead of appointing some one else, Acharya Shankar himself presided over the Kanchi Peetha during his lifetime. Sureshwaracharya comes next to him in the order of Acharyas of that Matha.

First Acharya of Sharada Peetha

The first head of the Shardapeetha, according to its lineage, is named Brahmaswarup, adding Sureshwar in brackets. This either means that Brahmaswarup was another name of Sureshwara or that on the death of Acharya Shankar, head of the Kanchi Peetha, Sureshwaracharya, entrusting the burden of headship to another Acharya named Brahmaswarup himself shifted as Acharya of Kanchi Peetha. Maybe this arrangement was made as desired or indicated by the founder Acharya. Since Sureshwar-acharya had appointed Acharya Brahmaswarup as his representative during his own life time, it is just possible that for that reason Sureshwaracharya continued as head of Sharada Peetha with his name being mentioned in brackets after the name of Brahmaswarupa.

According to the records at Kanchi Peetha Acharya Sureshwar probably survived Acharya Brahmasawarup for some time. But since the previous Acharya had expired, his successor was appointed directly in a regular manner and not merely in representative capacity. Sureshwaracharya probably lived a bit longer. His continuing as head of the Kanchi Peetha for 70 years is no exaggeration.

Shankar's time in Kanchi Peetha records

According to the records preserved at Kanchi Peetha Shankar was born in 2593 Kali era. Mentioning how the statements of Sharda Peetha and Kanchi Peetha differed with each other, Pandit Baldev Upadhyaya, in the introduction to his Hindi translation of Shankar Digvijaya by Madhava,[1] says "(a) According to Kanchipeetha the Acharya was born in 2593 Kali era and died in 2625 Kali era. (b) According to Sharda Peetha Shankar was born on Vaishakh Shukla Panchami, 2631 Kali era and died on Kartika Paurnamashi 2663 Kali Era.

1. Published in 2000 V. E. from Shravananatha Jyan Mandir, Hardwar.

No difference between the records of Sharda and Kanchi Peethas

The word 'Kali Varsha' in the version of Sharada Peetha, as quoted by Shri Upadhaya, is not correctly reproduced. The linealogy in question is before us. In fact there is no mention there of the Kali era; it is the Yudhishthir era. In the Kamkoti records, on the other hand, it is the Kali era. They indicate the difference in the commencement of the Yudhishthir and Kali eras. The date of birth of the Acharya, as given at Sharda Peetha is in the Yudhishthir Era while at Kamakoti peeth it is in the Kali era. This means that there is a difference of 38 years between the two eras. It is well known that the commencement of the Yudhishthir era marked his coronation. Yudhishthir ruled for 36 years after which realising that after the death of Shri Krishna Kali Yuga was fast approaching, he enthroned his grand sons Parikshit and left for the Hymalayas along with his brothers and Darupadi. Kali era probably set in about two years after Parikshit was enthroned.[1] The Kali era thus commenced 38 years after the commencement of the Yudhisthir era. As such there is no difference between the versions of the two Mathas regarding Shankar's date of birth.

Just as the Kali era began 3102 years before the Christian era, the Yudhishthir era began 3140 years before it. If Shankar's date of birth is to be determined according to the Sharda Peeth we need subtract 2631 years of Yudhishthir era from 3140 years of Y.E. before Christ. Shankar was thus born in 509 BC (3140-2631)=509). If his date of birth is to be determined according to Kanchi Kamakaoti Peeth we shall have to subtract 2593 years of Kali era from 3102 years of Kali era before Christ. In

1. Although the Shrimadbhagvata (1-15-36) says that Kaliyuga set in with the passing away of Shri Krishna.
यदा मुकुन्दो भगवानिमां महीं जहौ स्वतन्वा श्रवणीयसत्कथः ।
तदाऽहरेवाप्रतिबुद्धचेतसामधर्म हेतुः कलिरन्ववर्त्तत ॥
Maybe this was said out of too much devotion for Shri Krishna; as if Shri Krishna's existence was a check on it and as soon as he passed away it emerged. Even if Kali-yuga commenced a few years after there is nothing to be reconciled there. Such like usages are quite common in every-day life.

that case also the date of Shankar's birth will fall in 509 BC. It is all the same in either case. The misunderstanding is due to one's confusing the Yudhishthir era with the Kali era with a gap of 38 years.

The Lineage of Kanchi Kamakoti

According to the records maintained at Kanchi Kamakoti Peeth, the Matha was established in 2620 Kali era or 2958 Y.E. i.e. 482 BC. At that time Shankar was about 26-27 years old. The Achrya himself was its head for 6 years. After his death Sureshwaracharya succeeded him. The names of the Acharyas uptodate and the period during which era each served as such are given below :

S. No.	Name of Acharya	Duration	Upto K.E.		Christian Era
1.	Shankracharya	6	2626		476 BC.
2.	Sureshwaracharya	70	2696		406 ,,
3.	Sarvajnatman	42	2738		364 ,,
4.	Satyahbodh	96	2834		268 ,,
5.	Jnananand	63	2897		205 ,,
6.	Shuddhanand	81	2978		124 ,,
7.	Anandjnan	69	3047		55 ,,
8.	Kaivalyanand	83	3130		28 AD
9.	Kripashankar (2)*	41	3171		69 ,,
10.	Sureshwar (2)	58	3229		127 ,,
11.	Chidghana	45	3274		172 ,,
12.	Chandrashekhar (1)	63	3337		235 ,,
13.	Sachhidghan	37	3374		272 ,,
14.	Vidyaghan (1) (S.E. 239)	45	3419		317 ,,
15	Gangadhar (1)	12	3431		329 ,,
			Kali era	Vikram Era	
16.	Ujjwalshankar (3)	38	3469	424	367
17.	Sadashiva	8	3477	432	375

* Name of Acharyas ending with 'Shankar' and those being repeated are followed by 2, 3, 4, etc. in brackets.

18.	Surendra	10	3487*	442	385
19.	Vidya-ghan (2)	13	3500	455	398
20.	Mukshankar (4) (S.E. 359)	39	3539	494	437
21.	Chandrachud (1)	10	3549	504	447
22.	Paripurnabodh	34	3583	538	481
23.	Sachchitsukh	31	3614	569	512
24.	Chitsukh (1)	15	3629	584	527
25.	Sachchidanandaghan	21	3650	605	548
26.	Pajnaghan	16	3666	621	564
27.	Chidvilasa	13	3679	634	577
28.	Mahadeva (1)	24	3703	658	601
29.	Purnabodh (1)	17	3720	675	618
30.	Bodh (1)	37	3757	712	655
31.	Brahmanandghan (1)	13	3770	725	668
32.	Chidanandghan	4	3774	729	672
33.	Sachchidanand (2)	20	3794	749	692
34.	Chandrashekhar (2)	18	3812	767	710
35.	Chitsukh (2)	27	3839	794	737
36.	Chitsukhanand	21	3860	815	758
37.	Vidyaghan (3)	30	3890	845	788**
38.	Abhinawashankar (5)	52	3942†	897	840
39.	Sachchidvilasa	33	3975	930	873
40.	Mahadeva (2)	42	4017	972	915
41.	Gangadhar (2)	35	4052	1007	950
42.	Brahmanandghan	28	4080	1035	978
43.	Anandghan	36	4116	1071	1014
44.	Purnabodh (2)	26	4142	1097	1040
45.	Paramshiva (1)	21	4363	1118	1061
46.	Bodh (2)	37	4200	1155	1096
47.	Chandrashekhar (3)	68	4268	1223	1166
48.	Advaitanandabodh	34	4302	1257	1200
49.	Mahadeva (3)	47	4349	1304	1247
50.	Chandrachud (2)	50	4399	1354	1297

* In the record of the Peeth it is 3486 K.E.

** The year of Shankar's birth according to western scholars.

† In the peeth's records it is 3941 K.E.

In this list S.E. at serial Nos. 14, 20, and 25 indicates the Southern era.

51.	Vidyatirtha	88	4487	1442	1385
52.	Shankaranand	32	4519	1474	1417
53.	Purnanand Sadashiva	81	4600	1555	1498
54.	Mahadeva (4)	9	4609	1564	1507
55.	Chandrachud (3)	17	4626	1581	1524
56.	Sarvajna Sadashivbodh	15	4641	1596	1539
57.	Paramshiva (2)	47	4688	1643	1586
58.	Atmabodh	52	4740	1695	1638
59.	Bodh (3)	54	4794	1749	1692
60.	Advayatmaprakash	12	4806	1761	1704
61.	Mahadeva (5)	42	4848	1803	1746
62.	Chandrashekhar (4)	37	4885	1840	1783
63.	Mahadeva (6)	31	4916	1871	1814
64.	ChandraShekhar (5)	37	4953	1908	1851
65.	Mahadeva (7)	40	4993	1948	1891
66.	ChandraShekhar (5)	17	5010	1965	1908
67.	Mahadeva (8)	7days	,,	,,	,,
68.	Chandra-Shekharendra Saraswati, Present Acharya				

The Difference in the Number of Acharyas of Diflerent Mathas

According to both-the Sharadapeetha (Dwarika) and the Kanchi Kamakoti-the Acharya's date of birth is fixed in 509 BC. The present Acharya of Shardapeeth is 77th in succession while the one at Kanchi Kamakoti is 68th. The difference is negligible in view of the long lists of Acharyas at the two mathas. According to the tradition of these two mathas the Acharyas to be eligible for headship must necessarily come direct from Brahmacharya to Sanyas. Naturally, therefore, the period of head ship in each case there is longer than in the case of the Mathas where an Acharya can be initiated into Sanyas after Grihasthashrama (Household). This is true of Govardhan Peeth (Jagannathpuri).

The Lineage of Goverdhan Peeth

The present Acharya at Govardhan Peeth is 144th in succession, the reason for this larger number there being that the Acharyas appointed there are mostly those who are initiated

into Sanyas after Grihasthashrama. The present Acharya[1] was kind enough to supply us an uptodate list of the Acharyas of that Matha. However, the duration of headship in each case is not mentioned in the list. The list of names is given below:

1. Padmapada	2. Shulapani
3. Narayana (1)	4. Vidyaranya (1)
5 Vamadeva (1)	6. Padmanabha
7. Jagannath (1)	8. Madhureshwara
9. Govind (1)	10. Shridhar (1)
11. Madhawanand (1)	12. Krishnabrahmanand
13. Ramananda (1)	14. Vageeshwara
15. Parmeshwar	16. Gopala (1)
17. Janardana (1)	18. Jnanananda
19. Brihadaranya	20. Mahadeva
21. Parabrahmananda	22 Ramananda (2)
23. Sadashiva (1)	24. Harishwarananda
25. Bodhananda (1)	26. Ramakrishna (1)
27. Chidbodhatma	28. Tatwakshara
29. Shankara (1)	30 Vasudeva (1)
31. Hayagreeva (1)	32. Smriteeshwara
33. Vidyananda (1)	34. Mukundananda
35. Hiranyagarbha	36. Nityanand
37. Shivananda (1)	38. Yogeshwara
39. Sudarshana	40. Vyomakesha
41. Damodara (1)	42. Yogananda
43. Golakesha	44. Krishnanada (1)
45. Devananda	46. Chandrachuda
47 Halayudha	48. Siddhya Sevya
49. Tarakatma	50. Bodhayana
51. Shridhara (2)	52. Narayana (2)
53. Sadashiva (2)	54. Jayakrishna
55. Virupaksha (Kshya?)	56. Vidyaranya (2)
57. Vishweshwara	58. Vibodheshwar

1. Jagadguru Shankaracarya, Shri Niranjandevatirtha. While on a visit to Gaziabad once he was requested by the author to send a list of Acharyas uptodate. This he did But the list did not indicate the duration of headship in each invidividual case. The matter is being pursued.

59. Maheshwara (1)
60 Madhusudan (1)
61. Raghuttama (1)
62. Ramachandra (1)
63. Yogindra
64. Maheshwara (2)
65. Omkara
66. Narayana (3)
67. Jagannatha (2)
68. Shridhara (3)
69. Ramchandra (2)
70. Tamraksha
71. Ugreshwara
72. Uddanda (?) Uddamananda, Udayananda
73. Sankarshana
74. Janardana (2)
75. Akhandatma
76. Damodara (2)
77. Shivananda (2)
78. Vinyadhara
79. Gadadhara
80. Vamana
81. Shankar (2)
82. Neelakantha
83. Ramakrishna (2)
84. Raghuttama (2)
85. Damodara (3)
86. Gopala (2)
87. Mrityunjaya
88. Govinda (2)
89. Vasudeva (2)
90. Gangadhara
91. Sadashiva (3)
92. Vamadeva (2)
93. Upamanyu
94. Hayagreeva (2)
95. Hari
96. Raghuttama (3)
97. Pundarikaksha
98. Parashankaratirtha
99. Vedagarva
100. Vedantabhaskara
101. Vijnanatma
102. Shivananda (3)
103. Maheshwara (2)
104. Ramakrishna (3)
105. Vrishadhwaja
106. Shudhabodha
107. Someshwara
108. Gopadeva
109. Shambhutirtha
110. Bhrigu
111. Keshawananda
112. Vidyananda (2)
113. Vedanannda
114. Bodhananda (2)
115. Sutapanada
116. Shridhara (4)
117. Janardana (3)
118. Kamanashananda
119. Hariharananda (2)
120. Gopala (3)
121. Krishnananda (2)
122. Madhavananda (2)
123. Madhusudana (2)
124. Govinda (3)
125. Raghuttama (3)
126. Vamadeva (3)
127. Hrishikesha
128. Damodara (4)
129. Gopalananda
130. Govinda (4)
131. Raghuttama (5)
132. Ramachandra (3)
133. Govinda (5)
134. Raghunatha
135. Ramakrishna (4)
136. Madhusudana (3)

13.7 Damodara (5)
138. Raghuttama (6)
139. Shiva (1849-70; 21 yrs)
140. Lokanatha (1870-83-13 yrs)
141. Damodara (6) (1883-98-15 yrs)
142. Madhusudana (4) (1898-1926-28)
143. Bharatikrishana (1926-60, 34 yrs.)
144. Niranjandeva (1964-

Average duration of Headship

The total duration of headship of last 5 (139-143) Acharyas comes to 113 years, giving an average of 22 years and 6 months. Sometimes the post remains vacant for a few years after the death of an Acharya. For instance, the present Acharya Govardhanapeeth was appointed about 4 years after the death of his predecessor. This naturally reduces the number of Acharyas, thereby increasing their duration to some extent.

The Govardhana Peetha has had 143 Acharyas so far. The Matha, according to the chronology of Sharda Peetha, was established in 2655 Y.E. or 485 BC. i.e. 2453 years ago (1968). The average period of headship for each Acharya thus comes to 17 years. While the number of Acharyas at Sharda Peeth and Kanchi-kamakoti peeth is half of that at Goverdhana Peeth, the duration of Headship is almost double. This is due to the fact that whereas at the Sharda and the Kanchi Kamakoti Peeths the Acharya enters Sanyas direct from Brahamcharya, at Govardhan Peeth he comes to Sanyas from Grihastha Ashram. Thus the number of Acharyas at the various maths during a period of about 2500 years does not in any way involve any anomaly or discrepancy in the dates of their foundation. Thus, the data available at this (Govardhan Peetha) Matha lends support to 509 BC. being Shankar's year of birth.

The Lineage at Jyotir Matha

According to the data of Dwarkapeetha Acharya Shankar stayed at Badrikashrama from Phalguna Shukla Dvitiya 2640 to Jyeshta Amavasya 2646 Y.E. It was during this period that the Acharya regenerated the Badrinath temple, established the Jyotirmatha and wrote commentaries on Brahmasutra etc. Maybe the Acharya first undertook the regenration of Badrinath temple and thereafter established the Matha. If the first year of his stay there is taken to have been devoted to the regeneration of the temple the

following year can be assigned to the establishing of the Matha. One thing is certain that the Matha was established sometime during the Acharya's stay there for 5 years and 3 months. The Matha could have possibly been established in the second year i.e. 2642 Y.E. The installation of Trotakacharya as head of Jyotirmatha was ordered by the Acharya in 2654 Y.E. on Paurnamasi of Pausha[1]. This corresponds to 429 V.E. or 486. BC. The lineage of Acharyas should begin from this installation of Trotakacharya.

An uninterrupted list of the Acharyas of Jyotirmathas is not available. It is said that a lot of material concerning the Jyotir matha was preserved by the Tehri State. Only recently its Dewan, Shri Hari Krishna Raturi brought out a book on the History of Garhwal (Garhwal Ka Itihas) in 1920 A.D. At page 55 we read—

"The sanyasi Mahant of Jyotirmatha used to be the head of Badrinath temple as well as its priest. But this list is available only from 1554 V.E. or 1497 AD onwards. This is as follows :—

S. No.	Name of Mahant	Year of entry into worship	Year of death	Duration
1.	Bal Krishna[2]	1500[3]	1557	57
2.	Haribrahma	1557	1558	1
3.	Harismarna	1558	1566	8
4.	Vrindabana	1566	1568	2
5.	Anantanarayana	1568	1569	1
6.	Bhawananda	1569	1583	14
7.	Krishnananda	1583	1593	10
8.	Harinarayana	1593	1601	8
9.	Brahmananda	1601	1621	20
10.	Devananda	1621	1636	15
11.	Ragunatha	1636	1661	25
12.	Purnadeva	1661	1687	26
13.	Krishnadeva	1687	1696	9
14.	Shivananda	1696	1703	7
15.	Balkrishna (')	1703	1717	14
16.	Narayana Upendra	1717	1750	33
17	Harishchandra	1750	1763	13
18.	Sadananda	1763	1773	10
19,	Keshava	1773	1781	8
20.	Narayanatirtha	1781	1823	42
21.	Ramakrishna	1823	1833	10

1. This is according to Dwarika Peetha.
2. In the list every name ends in "Swami." We have only given the proper name.
3. According to the introduction quoted above the list is said to begin from 1554 onwards, But here it starts from 1500. The discrepency is not explained.

Until 1833 Y.E. i.e. 1776 AD the Dandi Swamies of Shankar sect held the charge of Jyotirmatha as well as the Badrinath temple. Thereafter it passed on to Brahmachari Rawals. It is said that when the last Mahant of Shankar Sect, Ramakrisnaswami died there was no other Dandiswami there at the time. The ruler of Garhwal, Maharaja Pradeepshah, then appointed one Brahmchari Gopal who was a Namboodiri Brahman and who used to prepare Bhoga (oblations) for the deity of temple, designating him as Rawala".

Thus with the last Acharya dead without a successor having been nominated the Jyotirmatha remained and continued without any Acharya. The management of its property etc. remained with the Rawal. In the absence of any Acharya the supervision was undertaken by the ruler of Tehri.

Divine Wrath on Garhwal

Najibuddaula (Jalaluddin King of Delhi, attacked Garhwal in in 1835 V.E. or 1778 AD. After this event the then ruler of Garhwal, Pradeep shah died in 1837 V.E. (1780 AD.). Ten years after this i.e. in 1847 V.E. or 1790 AD. Maharani Rajendralakshmi of Nepal attacked Garhwal and annexed the fort of Langurgarh. The then ruler of Garhwal, Maharaj Jaikrit-shah, agreed to pay Rs. 25,000/ annually to the Gorkhas.

The misfortune of Garhwal did not end there. 4-5 years after i.e. in 1851-52 V.E. (1794-95 AD) Garhwal was in the grip of famine. The people of Garhwal had hardly forgotten this calamity when in 1860 V.E. (1803 AD) an earthquake ruined it. This was soon followed by another attack by the Gorkhas

led by Amarsingh Thapa in that very year. This time Thapa had with him 'Hastidal Chautarya.' The then Maharaj of Garhwal, Parakramshah, fought the battle bravely but it was won by the Gorkhas. Srinagar, the capital of Garhwal, fell into the hands of Gorkhas. The Royal family somehow escaped to Bangarh across the Alakhnanda.

Later on, as a result of political manouverings, the Gorkhas were ousted by the British in 1871 V.E. or 1814 AD. Then in 1875 V.E. (1815 AD) Garhwal was partitioned, the eastern part going to the British Government and the westren part remaining with the Maharaja. Tehri remained the capital of the western part. Raja Sudarshan Shah, son of Maharaja Pradumnashah, became the ruler.

Acharya In Jyotirmatha Installed Again.

During this long period of political upheaval in Garhwal from 1833 to 1997 i.e. continuously for 164 years Jyotirmatha remained without an Acharya. It was in Chaitra in 1898 V.E. that Shri Brahmanand Saraswati was appointed its head.

After Acharya Trotaka the order of Acharyas in Jyotirmatha remained undisturbed upto 1833 V.E. or 1776 AD. The list of Acharyas from 1500 V.E. i.e. 1443 AD given above contains 21 names. The average period of headship for each comes to 16 years. As already stated Acharya Shankar established the Jyotirmatha in 2642 Y.E. But he ordered the appointment of Trotakacharya as its head in 2654 Y.E. The order of Acharyas should reasonably be taken to commence from this date which corresponds to 429 before Vikram or 486 BC. The total period upto 1500 V.E. comes to 1929 years. During this span names of not more than 21 Acharyas have come to be known. Kaviratna Pt. Mayadatta Shastri writes in his book 'Jyotish Peetha Paricharya' (P. 16)-"Names of these previous Acharyas are found in the Manuscripts Library of Pandeya Rathas of Kurmanchals of Paithani Village; Appendix of Mantra Rahasya; and Mahakavya Vyakhyavali. In the hilly regions of that side these names are current in the form of psalms. In the following verse these names are composed as—

त्रोटको विजयः कृष्णः कुमारो गरुडः शुकः,
विन्ध्यों विशालो वकुलो वामनः सुन्दरोऽरुणः ।
श्रीनिवासः सुखानन्दो विद्यानन्दः शिवो गिरिः,
विद्याधरो गुणानन्दो नारायण उमापतिः ॥
एते ज्योतिर्मठाधीशा आचार्याश्चिरजीविनः,
य एतान् संस्मरेन्नित्यं योगसिद्धिं स विन्दते ॥

These names of Acharyas from Trotaka to Umapati are 21 in number. Even if they were long lived this number spread over 1900 years is very small. There must be some mystery about this number. We find in the lists of Acharyas of other maths several names being repeated at different times. In the lists of Kamakoti Peeth a number of names are repeated 4, 5 or even 6 times each. Two of them occur 7 or 8 times. 38 names have been assigned there for as many as 70 Acharyas. This clearly shows that several Acharyas had been known by one name. It seems that in the verse quoted above only the names used and not the complete list of Acharyas have been mentioned. Maybe the same name was borne by 4-6 Acharyas at different times. This presumption can account for 40-45 Acharyas during this long period. In the Sharada Peetha there were 48 Acharyas during that much period. Assuming about the same number for Jyotirmatha may be quite reasonable. 21 should have been the number of names used repeatedly by all the Acharyas. Adding 21 Acharyas from 1500 to 1833 to the previous number of 45 the total arrived at upto 1833 comes to 66. The Matha remained without any Acharya for 164 years which period may account for another 9-10 Acharyas. Thereafter Shri Brahmananda Saraswati became its Acharya in 1998 Vikrami.[1] In this way, in all 76 Acharyas may be assigned to Jyotirmatha. This number compares reasonably well with that of other Mathas except that of Govardhan Peetha, the reason whereof has already been explained. Thus the lineage of Acharyas at the Jyotirmatha also does not stand in our way while fixing 509 BC as the date of birth of Acharya Shankar. It rather supports the theory eastablished on the bases of other Mathas. Let us now examine the lineage at Shringeri Math.

1. He died in 1969 AD.

The Lineage of Shringeri Matha

The dispute between the Shringeri and the Kanchi Kamakoti Mathas is quite old. It is difficult to say how and when it originated. Maybe the apprehension of the the feeders being divided between two institutions in the same area and with similar objects was its root cause. We have been able to obtain some literature about Shringeri Matha from its present Acharya, Jagatguru Shri Abhinavavidyatirtha. There is one book entitled 'काशी में कुम्भकोणमठविषयक विवाद' (Dispute about Kumbhakona Matha) presenting a very vivid picture of the dispute between these two Mathas. According to it the only Matha established by Shankar himself in the south is that of Shringeri. Kanchi Kamakoti etc. were never established by the Acharya.

But we are not concerned with this mutual dispute. We are only investigating into the date of birth of the Acharya. We find a mention of the Acharya having gone to Kanchi and his staying there for some time, in the literature available at any of the Mathas. The Kamakshi temple there was a great attraction for the Acharya. His devotion to this temple is evident from the writings about him.

Acharya's stay at Kanchi

A study of the literature on the life of Acharya[1] makes it clear

1. This literature comprises the following works:-
   1. Shankar Vijaya by Anantanand Giri, known as Anand Giri. This Anand Giri should not be confused with Anandgiri who wrote a treatise on Shankar's commentary on Vedant.
   2. Shankarvijayavilasa by Chidvilasayati (This has not yet been pudlished. A copy of the same in Tailang letters is preserved in the Matha's Oriental Library. Shankar Digvijaya by Baldev Upadhyaya P. 576).
   3. Punyashlokamanjari by Sarvajna Sadashivabodh, the 56 th Acharya of Kanchi Kamakoti Peetha from 1581 to 1596 V.E. or 1524-1539 A.D.
   4. Gururatnamala by Paramshivendra Saraswati, the 57th Acharya.
   5. Guru Vanshakavyam (1730 A.D.) by Lakshman Shastri, a characterisation of the Acharyas of Shringeri Matha. It

that after establishing the four Mathas the Acharya did stay at Kanchi-Kama-koti for some years. This was towards the end of his life. His continued stay could very easily result in the establishment of an institution there. The Acharya must have been accompanied by several of his disciples. After his death his disciples must have kept the institution going. True, that, unlike the other four Mathas, the one at Kamakoti was not established in the form of a Matha. Nevertheless due to the Acharya's stay there for a number of years this institution grew up in its natural course and the Acharya remained intimately connected with it. The lineage of Acharyas of Kanchi Kamakoti throws much light on the advent of the founder Acharya. As already explained it quite tallies with the other Mathas except the one at Shringeri. Let us now discuss the lineage at Shringeri.

Lineage at Shringeri broken in the middle

From Shankarcharya up-to-date, the list of Acharyas of Shringeri Matha contains only 35 names. This list is given a few pages after. The first two names therein are those of Shankar and Sureshwara respectively. Acharya Shankar himself did not act as Acharya of any Matha. The list, after excluding his name, is reduced to 34 names, the first name being that of Sureshwar. The four chief disciples of Shankar were Padamapada, Hastamalaka, Trotaka and Sureshwar. The first three of them obtained both education and Sanyas from Acharya Shankar. The fourth one was Sureshwar. He was Mandanmishra when in grihastha-ashrama and had as such, held discussion with the Acharya. He was himself a great scholar, well versed in all the scriptures. He did not receive instruction from the Acharya but was only initiated into Sanyas by him. He was much older than Acharya Shankar. Though his disciple he was held in high esteem in his circle.

contains a reference to the Acharyas going to Kanchi and installing the Devi in Shlokas 34-35 of canto 3.

6. Keraliyashankar Charitam by Govindnath Yati (All this information is based on the appendix by Pt. Baldev Upadhyaya, Hindi translator of Madhava's Shankar-Digvijaya).

The first heads of Mathas

According to the records maintained at the Dwarkapeeth and other Mathas Acharya Shankar deputed his disciples at the various Mathas as follows:—

Peetha.	*Name of Acharya*
Jyotishpeetha	Trotakacharya
Sharadapeeth (Dwaraka)	Sureshwaracharya
Shringeripeetha	Hastamalakacharya
Goverdhanpeetha (Puri)	Padmapadacharya

Of these there is no dispute about the first and fourth Acharyas. The headship of the second and third is, however, diputed as far as the peethas assigned to each of them are concerned.[1] In Mathamnayasetu Sureshwar and Hastamalaka are mentioned as Acharyas of Shringeri and Sharadapeetha (Dwaraka) respectively.

In the table about the various Mathas given at page 22 of the introduction of Vedantashankarbhashya[2] published from Bombay with the Ratnaprabha, Bhamati and Nyayanirnaya (of Anandgiri) commentaries "Prithvidhara' is named as the first Acharya of Shringeri Matha, the information being based on Mathamnayasetu. In the foot-note below Sureshwaracharya is given against Prithvidhara. This means that Prithvidhara was another name of Sureshwaracharya. But at page 74 of the introduction of the Hindi version of Shankar Digvijaya[3] in the table of Mathas given under the head 'Advaitamathamnaya' Prithvidhara followed by Hastamalak in brackets is mentioned as

1. द्वारकाख्यं हि क्षेत्रं स्याद् देवः सिद्धेश्वरः स्मृतः ।
   भद्रकाली तु देवी स्यात् हस्तामलकदेशिकः ।। शारदामठाम्नाय 2 ।।
   कामाक्षी तस्य देवी स्यात् सर्वकामफलप्रदा ।
   सुरेश्वराख्य, आचार्यस्तुङ्गभद्रेति तीर्थकम् ।। शृङ्गेरीमठ—3 ।।
2. Published in 1970 V.E. by Khemraj Shrikrishnadas from Shri Venkateshwar Press Bombay.
3. Hindi translation of माधवीय शङ्करदिग्विजय by Pandit Baldev Upadhyaya. Pub. by Mahant Shantanandnath from Shri ShravananathJnanamandir Hardwar in 2000 Y.E.

the first Acharya of Shringeri Matha. This gives rise to another problem—Whether Prithvidhara was another name of Sureshwara or of Hastamalaka.

Besides in the table of the said Bombay edition of Shankar's bhashya the name of Padmapada is also given alongwith Vishwarupacharya (Sureshwaracharya) as Acharya of Sharadapeetha (Dwarka). Similarly in the context of Govardhan Peetha (Puri) the name of Hastamalaka is given alongwith that of Padmanabha. This is reliably admitted that Vishvarupa was another name of Sureshwara and Prithvidhara that of Hastamalaka. How, in the introduction of the Bombay edition, Prithvidhar, is given as another name of Sureshwara is not clear. In case Prithvidhar is another name of Sureshwar, Sureshwar becomes the first Acharya of two Mathas (Dwarka and Shringeri) which is not supported by any source or tradition. This anomaly has to be cleared. As given in the table on page 22 of the Bombay edition of the said Bhashya, Vishwarupa was the first Acharya of Dwarka Peetha and this was definitely another name of Sureshwara.

How Kanchimatha came into being

As a result of deep digging into the literature available at the Shringeri and other Mathas of the South the reason for this anomaly appears to be this. Due to his unusual devotion for Kamakshi Devi Acharya Shankar spent most of his last days at Kanchi. Eventhough he did not establish any Matha at Kanchi, his long stay there alongwith his disciples led to the establishment of an institution there. It appears that the Acharya, in his last days, expressed his desire to entrust the management of this institution to Sureshwara who happened to be the seniormost-both in terms of knowledge and age. Without going into the details of the establishment of the peetha or the installation of its Acharya, Sureshwar was regarded as the first head of Kanchi Kamakoti eventhough formally he had been installed as Acharya of Sharda (Dwarka) Matha. Subsequently this institution grew up as a religious centre like the four Mathas established by Shankar. The head of this institution also began to be designated as Jagadguru Shankaracharya like those of other Mathas. Due to Sureshwar being its head the Kanchi institution

became quite popular and sacred from its very inception. Later, in course of time, the Shringeri Matha declined and was almost ruined.[1] How and why it so happened cannot be ascertained. But the details of its revival are well known.

Revival of Shringeri

This probably happened in the time of 37th Acharya of Kanchi Kamkotipeetha' Vidyaghan who headed it for 30 years from 759 to 783 A.D. May-be, his devotion to the founder Acharya Shankar and appreciation of his tremendous work aroused his sentiments. This might have led him to feel that the Shringeri Matha established by the founder Guru which had almost become defunct must be rejuvenated. With this determination he deputed one of his associates or disciples for the purpose. His name, as it appears in the list of Acharyas of Shringeri, was Nityabodhaghana, who in order comes only after Acharya Shankar and Sureshwar. According to the records maintained at Shringeri, he was the first Acharya of Shringeri and headed the Matha for 75 years from 773 to 848 AD. He became a Sanyasi in 757 AD. It was about this time that Vidyaghan became the Acharya at Kanchi Kamakoti Peetha in 759 AD. He should have become a Sanyasi a few years before his becoming Acharya. Nityabodhghan was appointed Acharya at Shringeri

1. In the footnote at page 7 of 'Jyotishpeetha Ka Parichaya' we read- "It is well khown that the Shringeri Matha continued without any Acharya for 500 years." (The book is authored by Kaviratna Pt. Mayadatta Shastri of Badrish Vidyapeetha and published by Pt. Jagdish prasad Mishra, Vice-President Mishra Bandhu Karyalaya Jabalpur C.P.) There may be other reasons for the disruption of Shringeri Matha. These are not yet known. From the historical tradition of the Mathas it may be concluded that at sometime on account of several calamities and difficulties this Matha might have been shifted to Kudli. At that time also the Matha should have been nearing destruction. It failed to maintain its old traditions. That the tradition of Kudli Matha is older than that of the present Shringeri is well known. Details about Kudli Matha are given after Shringeri.

15 years after Vidyaghan had been installed at Kamakoti. Nityabodhghan was certainly from Kamakoti Peetha. His name itself is the strongest point to support it.

The First Acharya af Shringeri (Present)

Names of Acharyas ending in 'Ghana' belong to those of Kamakoti Peetha only. How Sanyasies initiated in the various Mathas established by Acharya Shankar should be named is laid down in the books of instructions at the respective Mathas. The particular endings in names of Sanyasis at the various Mathas have been specified as follows :—

Sharda Matha (Dwarka)	Tirtha, Ashrama
Govardhan (Puri)	Vana, Aranya
Jyotirmatha (Badrikashrama)	Giri, parvata, sagara
Shringeri	Saraswati, Bharati, Puri

The tradition is generally followed in the names of Sanyasies and Acharyas of Shankar Sect. The Acharyas of Kamakoti Peetha are not bound by this arrangement. Except the Kamakoti Peetha and two names in the Shringeri Peetha, names of Acharyas ending in 'Ghana' are not to be found in the lists of various Mathas. Among the Acharyas of Shringeri Nityabodhaghana and his disciples Jnanghana are the only two exceptions. But in the lists of Kamakoti, besides Vidyaghana contemporary of Shringeri's Nityabodhaghana names of several acharyas before and after him end in 'ghana'. There are some names which end in 'ghana' even after using 'Anand' as in 'Sachchidanandghana' (25) or 'Brahmanandghana' (31) etc. This particular form of names makes it quite clear that the first Acharya of Shringeri in the present list with his name ending in 'ghana' definitely came from Kamakoti peetha. As already stated this was due to the determination of the then Acharya of Kamakoti Vidyaghan to revive Shringeri Peeth.

Sentiments of Acharyas of Shringeri

Shringeri's tradition till then had become extinct. Acharya Nityabodhghana named his successor Jnanghana according to his own tradition. It seems that this cordial relationship between the two cotinued for some generations. Later on, the Acharyas

of Shringeri Matha might have developed a feeling that their Matha being one of the four estabished by Acharya Shankar himself, and the whole of South being its jurisdiction, should reasonably be supreme. The Acharya of Kamakoti Peetha on the other hand might have been under the impression that the Shringeri Matha having been revived by thier predecessors the latter should continue to be under their supremacy. This mutual reaction should have naturally resulted in spoiling the existing cordiality and giving place to hostility. This trend, unfortunately for the Aryan nation persits even today in all its nudity.

Connection of Shringeri (Present) with Shankar

In these circumstances it was but natural that the then Acharya of Shringeri tried to seek their relationship directly with the founder Acharya. Having completely lost their identity they could resort to anything for the purpose The only thing left to them was to forge their connection directly with the founder Acharya. In the lineage of Kamakoti Peeth Shankar's name was followed by Acharya Sureshwar. The Acharyas of Shringeri followed suit and inserted this name in the beginning of their present lineage. They never thought how this prolonged gap could be reconciled. In fact such considerations never weighed with them at a time when they were absorbed in somehow maintaining the prestige of their Matha. They did what suited them without pondering over what historical confusion might eventually be created thereby.

Authenticity of Acharya's time according to Shringeri Matha

According to the records of Shringeri Matha Acharya Nityabadhghan's time was from 757 to 848 AD. The time assigned to him thus is from his initiation into Sanyas up to his death. The time of his predecessor Sureshwaracharya is given as from his becoming Sanyasi in 701/2 to his death in 773 AD. According to Vivada[1] Sureshwar was installed Acharya in 712/13 AD. In

1. This information is based on Kashi me Kumbhaghon vishayak Vivad' which we got from the present Acharya of Shringeri Shri Abhinavavidyatirtha. By Vivad here we mean this book.

this very book Sureshwar's predecessor, founder Acharya Shri Shankarbhagavatpad's iime is given as from 684 to 716 AD. It says that "Shri Gurudeva was born in Kalatı in 684 AD. This corresponds to 3786 Kali era (3102 of Kali BC.+684AD).

Mention of Acharya Shankar's Date of Birth

There is a famous verse about Shankar's birth found on the first page of the various editions of Shankarabhashya' of Brahma sutra or elsewhere in the introduction etc. of some editions. This is as follows ;—

प्रासूत तिष्यशरदामतियातवत्यामेकादशाधिकशतोनचतु:सहस्र्याम्[1] ।
संवत्सरे विभवनाम्नि शुभे मुहूर्त्ते राधेसिते शिवगुरोर्गृहिणी दशम्याम् ॥

This verse[2] is said to be from Shankaramandaramaranda-Saurabha' or from Sadanands' Shankaradigvijaya.[3] In fact the original source of this verse is not known for certain. This means that Shivagurus' wife gave birth to a child on Vaisakh Shukla Dashami in 3889 K.E. which corresponds to 787/88 AD.

Another verse, meaning the same thing, has been known to us from our student life. This is also said to be from 'Shankaramandaramaranda Saurabha'. We have not so far seen this book, printed or otherwise. Who first quoted it therefrom is also not definitely known. The verse is as follows :

1. First part of this verse is said to be like this.
जाया सती शिवगुरोर्निजतुङ्गसस्थे सूर्ये कुजे रविसुते च गुरौ च केन्द्रे ।
2. Above the printed picture of the Acharya on the first page of the textual Brahmasutrabhashya, published by Nirnayasagar Bombay. Various editions of 1927 and 1948. We have not seen this book.
3. Page 31 of the introduction of Brahmasutrashankarbhashya with Ratnaprabha, Bhamati and Nyayanirnaya commentaries published by Khemraj Shrikrishnadas Edition 1970 V.E. Introduction by Venkatachal Sharma. We have not seen it.

निधिनागेभवन्ह्यब्दे विभवे मासि माधवे ।
शुक्ले तिथौ दशम्यां तु शङ्करार्योदय: स्मृत: ।।[1]

This verse means exactly what the previous one does. One thing is, however, certain that both were composed by scholars of the same school. The word स्मृत: at the end of the second verse indicates that its author, after ascertaining the time of Shankar from some other source, verified it in his own way. This means that the second verse is only a copy of the first. Which Shankar the author means here is difficult to say. In the first verse Shivaguru is the name of Shankar's father. It can, therefore, be said that the verse refers to the founder Shankaracharya. But nothing can be said for certain unless the original source of this verse is seen.

Cordiality between Shringeri and Kamakoti Mathas

On the basis of the scrutiny of the material available on the subject this verse may be said to have been composed at a time when the two mathas of Kamakoti and Shringeri maintained cordial relationship. As already stated, the credit of the survival of the almost defunct Shringeri Matha goes to Acharya Nityabodhghan, disciple and associate of 37th Acharya Vidyaghan of Kama koti. In the list of Acharyas of Kamakoti Abhinavashankar (5) is the successor disciple of Acharya Vidyaghana. He was a unique scholar and orator of his times. With a view to reviving the Shringeri Matha Acharya Nityabodhghana was appointed its head in 773 AD. He had been Sanyasi for 16 years prior to that. By that time Acharya Vidyaghan had completed 15 years as head of Kamakoti Peetha. In all he acted for 30 years as its head. Thus the new Acharya of Shringeri, Nityabodhghana received the cooperation of Acharya Vidyaghan for 15 years. Abhinavashankar (5) succeeded Acharya Vidyaghan as head of Kamakoti Peetha. This was exactly in 788 AD. In deference of the sentiments of his Guru, this Acharya, due to his scholarship

1. In this verse Nidhi denotes 9, Naga 8, Ibh 8. Vanhi 3. As a rule digits are read from right to left. Thus it comes to 3889. Shankar Arya was born on Vaishakha Shukla Dashmi of this kali year.

and oration, lent full support to his associate at Shringeri. His extensive tours and sermons went a long way to strengthen the Mathas and contribute to their prestige.

He continued as Acharya of Kamakoti for 30 years. Throughout the period of his headship Nityabodhghana remained Acharya at Shringeri. The total period of headship, according to the record of Shringeri was 75 years. This means that he continued as Acharya for another 8 years even after the death of Acharya Abhinavashankar of Kamakoti peeth. He was succeeded by his disciple, Acharya Jnanaghan who presided over the Matha for 32 years.

The Beginning of Rivalry Between Shringeri and Kamakoti Peetha

Throughout this long period there was perfect harmony between the two Mathas. Before the seeds of rivalry came to the surface after the lapse of a few generations some unidentified scholar, ignorant of the past traditions of the Matha, taking Abhinavashankar to be the founder Shankaracharya presented him as such. This became the basis for future writers and accordingly, many scholars even today believe 3889 K.E. or 787/88 AD to be the first Shankar's date of birth which actually was the date of installation of Abhinavashankai (5) as 38th Acharya of Kamakoti peetha.

Later on when the conflict between them became tense the authorities of Shringeri Matha, ignoring the past circumstances, inserted the names of the first Shankaracharya and Sureshwar just before the time of Nityabodhaghana, thereby completing the tradition of their Matha. Thus the time of the first Acharya Shankar given in the above quoted two verses as well as the records at Shringeri Matha should be considered in this context. As such they have no authenticity. They also differ from each other.

Shankar's time in Shringeri Literature

We find that in the literature pertaining to the present Shringeri Matha the first Acharya Shankar is said to have been born in 684 AD. But according to the verses quoted above it is 787/788 AD. The difference comes to 103 years. The latter (788 AD) is the year of installation of Abhinavashankar (5) as Acharya of

Kanchi Kamakoti Peetha. Being a profound scholar and strong crusader of the cause of Mathas he came to be regarded as a universally accepted Shankaracharya.

Within a century his devotee writers mentioned his time of installation as that of his birth. In later days this came to be regarded as relating to the first Shankaracharya.

After some time when the rivalry between Shringeri and Kamakoti became still more tense those at the helm of affairs at Shringeri felt the necessity of altering the already publicised time of Shankar. The resaon? According to their established tradition the first Acharya Nityabodhghana had been installed in 773 AD. How could then the time of Shankaracharya be fixed at 787/88 AD. Nor could they reconcile themselves to their Matha being traditionally connected with Kamakoti. They were thus forced to discard the date pronounced by the said verses and make the following amendment.

Shringeri time not authentic

Adding 57 years of supposed headship of Sureshwar and 32 years of Shanakar's life and subtracting the total 89 years from 773 AD being the date of Nityabodhaghan's installation, 684 AD was fixed as Shankar's time. This was done long after the installation of Nityabodhaghana. As already stated the names of Sureshwar and Shankar had been arbitrarily added in the list. As such there is no doubt about the date so arrived at being unauthentic.

The main reason for creating confusion in fixing up Shankar's time is the acceptance of the incomplete list of the present Shringeri Matha as complete. It will be worth while to reproduce here the available list of Acharyas of Shringeri Matha to facilitate comparison.

Shringeri Matha— List of Acharyas[1]

1. The list is based on the miscellaneous material available at Shringeri Matha. The Guruvanshakavyam, Shrimajjagadgurushankarmathavimarsha, Kashi me Kumbhaghonamatha-Vishayak Vivad etc. are worth being mentioned here.

S. No.	Name of Acharya	Christian Era From	Christian Era To	Period of headship.
1.	First Shankaracharya	684	716	—
2.	Sureshwaracharya	712	773	61
3.	Nityabodhaghanacharya	773	848	75
4.	Jnanaghanacharya	848	910	62
5.	Jnanottamacharya[1]	910	953	43
6.	Jnanagiryacharya	953	1038	85
7.	Sinhagiryacharya	1038	1098	60
8.	Ishwaratirtha	1098	1146	48
9.	Narsinhatirtha[2]	1146	1228	82
10.	Vidyashankartirtha	1228	1333	105
11.	Bharatikrishnatirtha	1333	1380	47
12.	Vidyaranya	1380	1386	6
13.	Chandra Shekhar Bharati (1)	1386	1389	3
14.	Narsinhabharati (1)	1389	1408	19
15.	Purushottamabharati (1)	1408	1448	40
16.	Shankaranand Bharati	1448	1454	6
17.	Chandrashekhar Bharati (2)	1454	1464	10
18.	Narsinhabharati (2)	1464	1479	15
19.	Purushottam Bharati (2)	1479	1517	38
20.	Ramachandra Bharati	1517	1560	43
21.	Narsinhabharati (3)	1560	1573	13
22.	Narsinhabharati (4)	1573	1576	3
23.	Narsinhabharati (5)	1576	1599	23
24.	Abhinavanrisinha (1) Bharati	1599	1622	23
25.	Sachchidanand Bharati (1)	1622	1633	11
26.	Narsinhabharati (6)	1663	1705	42
27.	Sachchidananad Bharati (2)	1705	1741	36

1. In 'Vivada' (p. 254) the name is Jnanottama Shivacharya.
2. In 'Vivada' it is Nrisinhatirtha

28.	Abhinavasachchidanand Bharati (1)	1741	1767	26
29.[1]	Abhinavanarsinha Bharati (2)	1767	1770	3
30.	Sachchidanand Bharati (3)	1770	1814	44
31.	Abhinavasachidanand Bharati (2)	1814	1817	3
32.[2]	Narsnihabharati (3)	1817	1879	62
33.	Sachchidanandshiva-bhinavanarsinha-bharati	1879	1912	33
34.[3]	Chandrashekhar Bharati (3)	1912	1954	42
35.	Abhinavavidyatirtha	1954	Present	

Except that at the Shringeri Matha the orderly traditions of all the Mathas established by the founder Acharya and other recognised institutions go to prove that Acharya Shankar was born in 509 BC. An effort has been made in the foregoing pages to explain the anomalies in Shringeri. There is no reason why the faithfully maintained indentical traditions of all the Mathas should be discarded and declared false in favour of the incomplete and doubtful records of Shringeri. A deep and critical study of the literature and other sources of the various other Mathas will lead any critical mind to conclude that there is definitely something

1. In 'Vivada' it is only 'Nrisinhabharati' (7)
2. ,, ,, ,, ,, ,, (8)
3. In Guruvanshakavya' the name of the 15th Acharya is Chandrashekhar Bharati (2) There is no such name in 'Kumbhakonamathavishayaka Vivada'. For this reason Narsinhabharati (4) at serial No. 23 of Guruvanshakavya is 22nd Acharya according to Vivada. Thereafter by adding the name of Narsinhabharati (5) in Vivada the number has been made to correspond with the 'Guru-vanshakavya[2]. As such in the list of 'Guruvanshakavya.' this 34th name is repeated fourth time while in 'Vivada' it is third time.

wrong somewhere at Shringeri. An effort has been made in the foregoing pages to expose such anomalies. An understanding of the position of Shringeri as discussed earlier tends to reconcile it with other Mathas.

It is the law of nature that things change in course of time. May-be, for reasons not known the Shringeri Matha had to be shifted to Kudli sometime after the Mathas had been established. That is why Kudli Matha is now said to be a branch of Shringeri, although its tradition is much older than that of the present Shringeri and in line with all other Mathas. The only reason for its being regarded as a branch may be that it was originally shifted from Shringeri. While Shringeri became almost extinct Kudli continued and still continues. But Shringeri, once it was revived, being the original Matha and due to the untiring zeal and efforts of the authorities concerned soon regained its lost glory. Now that it is up again it can rightly claim Kudli as its branch. Else, taking into consideration the present tradition of Shringeri, who would accept an old tree as a branch of a new one. This position of these Mathas is a proof of the devaluation of the tradition of Shringeri. Prior to Nityabodhaghana, the Shringeri Matha remained almost defunct for nearly 7-800 years.

The Kudli Matha

It has already been stated that the Shringeri Matha, a few centuries after its foundation, for reasons not known, became defunct or was ruined by its adversaries. Those at the helm of affairs then somehow escaped and with the help of some devotees took shelter in Kudli. The Matha continues to function here upto date. When the Shringeri Matha was revived and how long it remained defunct can be approximated on the basis of the following.

According to the record of Shringeri Matha Sureshwaracharya remained its Acharya for 725 years. As a matter of fact this is not possible.[1] The first head of the Shringeri Matha according to its

1. See introduction (p. 26) of Vedantsutrashankarbhasya with the three commentaries, pub. Shri Venkteshwar, Bombay, 1970.

present available tradition was Nityabodhghna. Sureshwaracharya is said to have been its head for 725 years before Nityabodhghana. Such a long span of life being imposible it can be assumed that the Shringeri Matha remained defunct during this long period. The Matha was revived by Nityabodhaghan who was installed in 773 AD. If the Matha is taken to have remained defunct for 725 years prior to him it means that it ceased to exist in (773-725 =48) 48 AD. As such the Kudli Matha came into being in the middle of the first century of the Christian era.

According to the record of Dwarkapeetha, the Shringeri Matha was first started in 2648 Y.E. corresponding to 429 BC. This means that the Shringeri Matha continued for (48+492= 540) 540 years before it was ruined. Approximately 12-15 Acharyas should have acted as its head during this period. If this number be added to the list of Acharyas of the present Kudli Matha almost a complete list of Acharyas of Shringeri Matha can be arrived at. There have been about 64[1] Acharyas at Kudli Matha. On adding 13-14 pervious Acharyas to this the total comes to 77/78 which falls in line with that of the other Mathas.

The duration of each Acharya is not given in the list of Acharyas of Kudli Matha. Otherwise it should have been quite easy to ascertain the name of the Acharya of Kudli Matha at the time of the revival of the Shringeri Matha by Acharya Nityabodhaghana. In that case the correctness of the said number could have been verified. A difference of 1-2 does not matter. The number of Acharyas at the various Mathas, except that at Goverdhanpeetha where the tradition is of the Acharyas becoming Sanyasi after grihastha, varies between 68 and 77, thereby giving an average of 30-35 years for each. For the Acharyas who become Sanyasi direct from Brhmacharya, this average is in order.

The list of Acharyas of Kudli Matha is given below:—[2]

1. Shri Shankaracharya.
2. Vishvarupabharati (Sureshwaracharya)

1. Ibid, page 27-28. Published in 1970. It then contained 63 names. May-be it has since gone up.
2. Ibid, page 27-28

3. Chidrupabharati
4. Gangadharbharati
5. Chidghanabharati
6. Bodhaghanabharati
7. Jnanottamabharti
8. Narsinhabhrati
9. Ishwarbharati
10. Vidyashankarabharati
11. Shrikrishnabharati
12. Shankarabharati
13. Chandrashekharbharati
14. Sachchidanandbharati
15. Brahmanandbharati
16. Chidghanabharati
17. Purushottamabharati
18. Madhusudanabharati
19. Jagannathabharati
20. Vishwanandbharati
21. Vimalanandbharati
22. Vidyaranyabharati
23. Vishwarupabharati
24. Bodhaghanabharati
25. Jnanottamabharati
26. Ishwarabharati
27. (Vijaya) Shankarabharati
28. Vidyatirthabharati
29. Bharatitirtha
30. Vidyaranyabharati
31. Narsinhabharati
32. Chandrashekharbharati
33. Ramchandrabharati
34. Shankarabharati
35. Narsinhabharati
36. Chandrashekharbharati
37. Purushosttamabharati
38. Narasinhabharati
39. Madhusudanabharati
40. Shrivishwarbharati
41. Gangadharabharati
42. Narasinhabharati
43. Shankarabharati
44. Purushottambharati
45. Ramachandrabharati
46. Narsinhabharati
47. Vidyaranyabharati
48. Narsinhabhararti
49. Shankarabharati
50. Narsinhabharati
51. Shankarabharati
52. Narsinhabharati
53. Shankarabharati
54. Narasinhabharati
55. Shankarabharati
57. Narasinhabharati
57. Shankarabharati
58. Narsinhabharati
59. Shankarabharati
60. Narsinhabharati
61. Narasinhabharati
62. Vidyashankarabharati
63. Shankarabharati[1]

That the present propaganda literature[2] of Shringeri Matha

1. The number of names used by 63 Acharyas is only 26. A similar note has already been given by us in the list of names of Acharyas of Jyotirmatha.
2. This literature includes "Shrimajjagadgurushankarmatha vimarsha' 'Kashi me KumbhakonamathaVishayaka Vivada (Contd.)

was prepared with a view to presenting any facts is doubtful. It will be no exaggeration to say that an effort was made by this literature to bury still deeper the facts obliterated by the dust of ignorance in course of time. Relying on the false assumptions of Shringeri Matha, these and other Westren and Indian writers tried with the help of material collected by them from Indian and foreign sources to show that Acharya Shankar could not belong to 509 BC. It is necessary to discuss it because without doing so the said time of the Acharya will remain doubtful.

etc. We have nothing to do with any Matha. Nort is it our intention to caste aspersions on anyone. We aim at arriving at a historical fact. Our statement here might injure somebody's feelings. But this is not our intention.

Chapter 3

OBJECTIONS ON REACHED TIME DISCUSSED

It is said that on the basis of the data now made available Acharya Shankar should have been born somewhere between 509 BC and 800 AD i.e. a period of nearly 1200-1300 years. One thing is certain that a person can be born at one specific point of time only. We have to locate that particular point. Every reason given in this matter makes one feel to some extent that he should content himself with it and stop probing further. We must give our thoughtful consideration to all of them. We might catch at something very valuable.

According to modern scholars[1] the following points must be kept in mind while deciding upon the time of Shankar.

(a) Shankar's Chief disciple Sureshwaracharya has mentioned the name of Buddhist scholar Dharmakirti, in his works. There is no doubt that this Dharmakirti was none else but Dharmakirti, the great Buddhist philosopher of Nyaya school. Dharmakirti flourished between 635 and 650 AD. This Dharmakirti was a student of Acharya Dharmapal, Head of the Nalanda University and a class-fellow of Acharya Shilbhadra who succeeded Dharmapal as Head of Nalanda. This Dharmakirti was also a student of Ishwarsen who was himself a student of Dinnaga(दिङ्नाग), the famous Buddhist philosopher of Nyaya School. He made valuable contribution to Buddhist Nyaya Philosophy by writing 'Pramanavartika,' 'Pramanavinishchaya,' 'Nyayabindu' etc. It is also said that Kumarilbhatta, author

1. See Achyuta(अच्युत) by Gopinath Kaviraj (Introduction of Hindi Translation of Brahmasutrashankarbhashya) P. 27-28

of 'Shlokavartika,' 'Tantravartika' etc. on Mimansa was his contemporary. Much can be known about the relationship between Dharmakirti and Kumarilbhatta from the history of Buddhism by the Tibetan Lama, Tarakanatha. Darmakirti's definition of perception (प्रत्यक्ष) as 'कल्पनापोढमभ्रान्तं' (see Nyayabindu 11, Benaras) has been rebutted in 'Shlokawartika'.[1] This definition was surely given by Dharmakirti and not by Dinnaga because Dinnag's definition of perception was not qualified by 'अभ्रान्तं'. In Dinnag's 'Pramanasamuchchaya' the definition of perception (प्रत्यक्ष) is given as below—

नापि पुनः प्रत्यभिज्ञाऽनवस्था स्यात् स्मृतादिवत् ।
प्रत्यक्षं कल्पनापोढं नामजात्याद्यसंयुतम् ॥
(प्रमाणसमुच्चय by Dinnaga Mysore Ed. P. 8)

(b) In the context of criticism of Yogachara Shankaracharya has himself quoted a part of Dharmakirti's Karika in his commentary on sutra 28, part 2 of chapter 2 of Sharirakbhashya. Following is the Karika of Dharmakirti—

सहोपलम्भनियमादभेदो नीलतद्धियोः ।
भेदश्च भ्रान्तविज्ञानैर्दृश्येतेन्दाविवाद्वये ॥

The part of this Karika quoted by Shankarachaıya is 'सहोपलम्भनियमादभेदः' (The first and second lines of this verse are found in Dharmakirti's Pramanavinishchaya and Pramanavartik respectively).

(c) Shankar has also quoted 'यदन्तर्ज्ञेयरूपं तत्' (2-2-28) from Dinnag's Alambanaparikasha.'

(d) Of the two statements of Buddhist scholars quoted by Shankar in his commentary of Brahmasutra (2-2-22 and 2-2-24)

1. In 'Shlokawartika' of Pratyakshasutra, the reading is
तदधीनत्वसाम्येऽपि कल्पनाऽपोढशब्दनात् ।
प्रत्यक्षं किञ्चिदेवेष्टं यथा तव तथैव नः ॥

The word 'अभ्रान्तं' has not been used here or elsewhere in Shloka-Vartika where the Buddhist definition of perception with अभ्रान्त adjective should have been discussed.

one is from 'Abhidharmakoshavyakhya' by Gunamati 630-640 AD.)

(e) The version quoted by Shankar in the context of his criticism of Jainisim seems to be that of Samantabhadra, Guru of Digambaracharya Akalank. Vachaspati Mishra, author of Bhamati has, in this context, quoted the following from Aptamimansa of Samantabhadra—

'स्याद्वादः सर्वथैकान्तत्यागात् किंवृत्तचिद्विधेः ।
सप्तभङ्गनयापेक्षो हेयादेयविशेषकृत् ॥' (2-2-33)

Akalank was a courtier of Raja Sahastunga. This Raja Sahastunga is another name of Dantidurga of Rashtrakuta. He reigned in 675 Shaka era or 753 AD. This Akalanka was the guru of Vidyanand, author of Ashtasahasri."

Criticism

These points really deserve consideration while trying to fix up the time of Shankracharya; because Shankaracharya and his chief disciple Sureshwaracharya have quoted from the works of other Acharyas and criticised their doctrines. The critic must belong to a period later than the one whom he quotes or criticses. As such Shankaracharya who quoted from Dharmakirti and others cannot belong to 509 BC. Let us, therefore, examine them one by one.

(a) One thing that must not be forgotten while considering the points is that the time of Buddhist philosophers as determined by Western scholars as well as modern Indian scholars is not necessarily all correct. It has already been stated here that Buddhist philosophers have made no mention of their time in their works. Whatever modern scholars have done on the subject is only an attempt to determine their time on the basis of external evidence. Although Shankaracharya also made no mention of his time, the tradition of the Mathas established by him continues undisturbed up to date.

In the face of such well established evidence can there be any justification for giving credibility or attaching any importance to statements which are based on mere conjectures and which by the language used by the authors themselves

appears to be doubtful. Their writings abound in phrases like, 'it seems, it may be,' or 'it might have been so,' 'if it be accepted' which shows that they are not sure of themselves. At best they can serve as indicators but they can never lead to definite conclusions. In contrast, the traditions of various Mathas provide us with thoroughly reliable material, leaving no room for any doubt. The so called time of Buddhist philosophers, itself based on conjectures, connot, therefore, be accepted as the correct base for dertermining Shankar's time. The date of Shankar has been determined on the basis of the undisturbed tradition of the mathas. Then, instead of trying to determine Shankar's time to suit the wrongly arrived at time of Buddhist philosophers, efforts should be made to determine the time of the latter on the basis of Shankar. This alone will be proceeding in the right direction.

Sureshwaracharya's Writings

We first examine his quoting from Dharmakirti. In the 'Brihadaranyakabhashyavartika' (Anandashram edition, 4-3-753, p. 1115) Sureshwaracharya says—

त्रिष्वेव त्वविनाभावादिति यद्धर्मकीर्त्तिना ।
प्रत्यज्ञायि प्रतिज्ञेयं हीयेतासौ न संशयः ।।

Acharya Sureshwar has herein refuted the doctrine of अविनाभाव in Buddhist philosophy in his 'Brihadarankopanishadbhasyawartika'. Sureshwar has discussed it[2] a little before the said

1. For the details in this context see Dharmakirti's Nyaybindu (न्यायबिन्दु) Chap. 2 para 14-25.
2. See Shloka 724 at page 1512 of बृहदारण्यकोपनिषद्भाष्यवार्त्तिक Poona Ed. The Shloka of Sureshwar is—
"अविनाभावसिद्ध्यर्थं नन्विदं वर्ण्यते त्रयम् ।
त्रिष्वेव त्वविनाभावाद्भद्रं तैरपि कीर्त्तितम् ।।"
Commenting on it Anandgiri, saying यथाह कीर्त्ति: (as said by Kirti) has quoted the following verse of Dharmakirti.
"पक्षधर्मस्तदंशेन व्याप्तो हेतुस्त्रिधैव सः ।
अविनाभावनियमाद्धेत्वाभासस्ततोऽपरः ।।
This verse is found in Pramanavartika 3-1. There the fourth stanza reads as "हेत्वाभासास्ततोऽपरे"

verse (753) with certain alternatives. In this context a situation has been assumed where nature (स्वभाव) and actions (कार्य) become one. In this case Dharmakirti's contention that the objective can be achieved in three ways falls flat to ground.

Where Dharmakirti has enunciated it in his works has been indicated here in the footnote. Acharya Sureshwar's criticism makes it crystal clear that Dharmakirti was his fore-runner. Again, Shankar and Sureshwar being contemporaries, there is no difficulty in assuming that Shankar came after Dharmakirti. From the comparison of the writings of Kumril and Sureshwar it appears that Dharmakirti did not flourish much earlier. Maybe, he was an early contemporary of Kumaril and died a little earlier than the latter. As will be soon discussed, Kumaril did not mention him in his works. Probably because of his being a contemporary he did not receive any attention although he was a little senior in age etc. By the time Sureshwar etc. appeared on the scene Dharmakirti had earned a name among the intellectuals and had been recognised as a towering personality in Buddhist society, Naturally, therefore. Sureshwar had to make special reference to him.

While Dharmakiriti's being a fore-runner of Shankar is a settled fact the date assigned to him is absolutely wrong. The time of Dharmakirti will have to be fixed in the light of Shankar's time decided on the basis of the material preserved at Shankar's Mathas.[1]

That Kumaril in his Shlokawartika etc. has refuted Dharmakirti's definition of perception (प्रत्यक्ष) does not appear to be correct. There is a Karika (Verse) in the context of 'Pratyakashasutra' of Shlokavartika.

तदधीनत्वसाम्येऽपि कल्पनापोढशब्दनात् ।
प्रत्यक्षं किञ्चिदेवेष्टं यथा तव तथैव नः ।।

The peculiarity of Dharmakirti's 'Pratyakshalakshana' lies in his use of the word अभ्रान्त in the Lakshana itself.[2] This word

1. This has been discussed at lenth in a subsequent chapter.
2. द्विविधं सम्यग् ज्ञानम्, प्रत्यक्षमनुमानञ्च । तत्र कल्पनापोढमभ्रान्तं प्रत्यक्षम्" Nyayabindu, Chap. I Sutra 2-4.

being absent from the verse of Kumaril, it cannot be conceded that it is a rebuttal of Dharmakirti's definition.

(b) Shankaracharya himself used, in his commentary of Brahmasutra (2-2-28), part of one of the Karikas of Dharmakirti. The Karika in question is—

सहोपलम्भनियमादभेदो नीलतद्धियोः ।
भेदश्च भ्रान्तविज्ञानैर्दृश्येतेन्दाविवाद्वये ॥

The opinion of modern scholars themselves[1] on this point is that seriatim this karika is nowhere to be found in any of Dharmakirti's works. Its first half is found in "Pramanavinishchaya. and the latter half in 'pramanavartika (2-389). But it has been revealed[2] that it is available, as it is, in Dharmakirti's 'Vadanyaya'.

Vachaspati Mishra in Bhamati, saying 'यथाह धर्मकीर्ति, has quoted the following Karika of this very sutra (2-2-28)—

तस्मान्नार्थे न च ज्ञाने स्थूलाभासस्तदात्मनः ।
एकत्र प्रतिषिद्धत्वाद् बहुष्वपि न सम्भवः ॥ इति ।

This karika is there in 'Pramanawartika.[3]

Only सहोपलम्भनियमादभेद is common in both Shankar's commentary and the karika. Even before Dharmakirti, the principle of विषय विज्ञान सहोपलम्भनियम was accepted in Buddhist philosoply. It is possible that in order to maintain the continuity of the principle such words were used in study and teaching and during mutual discussions. Dharmakirti might have adopted such traditional usages in his works. This could also be the basis for Shankar. May-be Dharmakirti was the first to introduce it in Buddhist literature.

When the existence of this principle before Dharmakirti is admitted how could it then be linked with him ?

1. See lines 3-4 in the footnote at page 28 of Achyuta by Dr. Gopinath Kaviraj.
2. According to Dr. R. C. Pendeya Head of the Deptt. of Buddhist studies in Delhi University.
3. In Pramanavartika 2-211 the reading of the first stanza is—'तस्मान्नार्थेषु न ज्ञाने'

The words 'नीलतद्धियोः could lend support to it. With a view to adjusting the meter Dharmakirti used the words नीलतद्धी instead of विषय विज्ञान or प्रत्ययविषय traditionally, used with हेतुपद सहोपलम्भनियमः. Shankar has, in his commentary used commonly used terms only. This shows not only that this principle was there with these very words being used with it but also that while Shankar was enunciating it, it was not necessary for him to be preoccupied with the said Karika of Dharmakirti.

As a matter of fact Acharya Shankar based his discussion on the same old tradition which was followed by Dharmakirti. Shankar's criticism was not essentially based on what Dharmakiriti had laid down. However we have no bias for it. But the use of the words 'सहोपलम्भनियमादभेद: by Shankar is no argument for their being a quotation from Dharmakirti.

(c) The statement attributed to Dinnaga has certainly been quoted in Shankarbhashya.' In Shankar's commentary of Brahmasutra (2-2-28) we read—

"अतश्चैवमेव सर्वे लौकिका उपलभन्ते यत्प्रत्याचक्षाणा अपि
बाह्यार्थमेव व्याचक्षते–'यदन्तर्ज्ञेयरूपं तद् बहिर्वदवभासते इति ।"

A detailed discussion of the words बहिर्वत् of the Karika then follows. There can be no doubt about its being a quotation from Dinnaga.

On the basis of this quotation we have no hesitation to admit that Shankar came after Dinnaga. The difficulty arises when Dinnaga is placed after Shankar's settled time and after assigning him a wrong date an effort is made to reverse Shankar's already established and admitted time. The root cause of all this confusion is assigning a wrong time to Lord Buddha. An effort must be made to first make a thorough study, in a dispassionate and detached manner, of the tradition of main dynasties of India after the Mahabharata war and then decide upon the time of Buddha, looking into it from an Indian and Asian point of view. This subject already enveloped in obscurity by Europeon Christian missionaries has been further made hazy in

1. There are only 8 verses in Dinnaga's आलम्बनपरीक्षा. The sixth verse there is like this—
यदन्तर्ज्ञेयरूपं तु बहिर्वदवभासते ।
सोऽर्थो विज्ञानरूपत्वात् तत्प्रत्ययतयापि च ॥

the name of research and revision.[1] What we mean to say is only that instead of tagging Shankar with the time of Dinnag we should try to adjust Dinnag according to the time of Shankar arrived at on the basis of the records of the Mathas.

(d) One of the two statements said to have been quoted in the commentary on Brahmasutra (2-2-22 & 2-2-24) is stated to be from 'Abhidharmakoshavyakhya' (अभिधर्मकोशव्याख्या) by Gunamati. In fact this is not a quotation. The text of the commentary in question is—

"अपि च वैनाशिकाः कल्पयन्ति-बुद्धिबोध्यं त्रयान्यत् संस्कृतं क्षणिकं चेति । तदपि च त्रयं प्रतिसंख्याऽप्रतिसंख्यानिरोधावाकाशं चेत्याचक्षते । त्रयमपि चैतदवस्त्वभावमात्रं निरुपाख्यमिति मन्यन्ते ।"

The basis of the said reference having been seen by Dr. Gopinath Kaviraj in Gunamati's 'Abhidharmakoshavyakhya' has not been specified by him in his work (Achyuta, P. 28). The said work (A. Vyakhya) is neither yet published nor available. If it is true that this reference is taken from Gunamati's 'Vyakhya' Gunamati must necessarily precede Shankar. But then the time (630-640 AD) assigned to Gunamati would be inconsistent. As such Gunamati's time shall have to be adjusted with that of Shankar which should reasonably be fixed in accordance with the material preserved in the Mathas.[2]

At another place (2-2-24) we find some sentences which appear to be quotations. But whether those are Shankar's own composition or taken from somewhere needs careful consideration. The commentary reads like this-"

"सौगते हि समये–'पृथिवी भगवः किंसन्निश्रया' इत्यस्मिन् प्रश्न-प्रतिवचनप्रवाहे पृथिव्यादीनामन्ते 'वायुः किंसन्निश्रयः, इत्यस्य प्रश्नस्य प्रतिवचनं भवति 'वायुराकाशसन्निश्रयः इति ।"

Certainly, this refers to some questions and answers in some

1. God willing, we propose to treat this subject historically.
2. In the present work the time of the founder Shankaracharya has already been fixed as 509 BC, relying on the records of Mathas.

book. While translating them Acharya Shankar has quoted quite a few phrases from the original work. These phrases are given in inverted commas. The word 'भगवः' in the first sentence indicates that it is from some Buddhist work, which has not yet been identified. A quotation from such an unidenitfied work of unknown time cannot form the basis for fixing Shankar's time. This quotation can be really helpful in fixing Shankar's time only when we are definite about the time of the author and his work.

(e) The last point to be considered in the context of fixing Shankar's time is "that the view quoted by Shankar in criticising Jainism appears to be that of Samantabhadra, the Guru of Digambaracharya Akalanka." The argument in support of this contention is "that Vachaspati Mishra, author of Bhamati, has quoted in this context from Aptamimansa[1] by Samantabhadra."

In fact this is the author's own imagination. He is not sure of his own statement. And it will be criminal to force this situation on Shankara, relying on such flimsy ground. Acharya Shankar discussed the Jain doctrine of स्याद्वाद (Syadvada) in a general way. Was it necessary for Shankar to refer to Samantabhadra's work for the purpose? This doctrine of Jain philosophy is as old as this Philosophy itself. There is nothing in Shankar's criticism to indicate that he has made use of any of Samantabhadra's works.

If Vachaspati Mishra has quoted from Samantabhadra's works it only means that Vachaspati Mishra came after Samantabhadra and that he has seen some aspect of the subject in his (Samantabhadra's) works. It will not be just to conclude from this that Shankar should have gone through Samantabhadra's work. In ancient philosophical works we find a mention of swift movement of things. While writing on the subject in such works, if a writer of today makes a reference by way of illustration to the present day aeroplanes, sputnics and rockets, will it be correct to conclude therefrom that the authors of those ancient works got the idea of swiftness from sputnics etc. As

1. स्याद्वादः सर्वथैकान्तत्यागात् किंवृत्तचिद्विधेः ।
सप्तभङ्गनयापेक्ष्ये हेयादेयविशेषकृत् ।। ब्र. सू. 2-2-33 की भामती)

the inventors of modern sputnics etc. are not indebted to the knowledge of swiftness as mentioned in ancient works, Samantabhadra cannot be regarded as one who introduced Syadvada in Jain Philosophy. Acharya Shankar discussed this issue in a general way. The works or Acharyas to whom he should be indebted for his knowledge of the theory is not known. But there is no evidence to show that Shankar had borrowed it from Samantabhadra.

Names of so called rulers in Shankar's works

An attempt has been made by certain scholars[1] to fix up Shankar's time by identifying several individual names occuring in Brahmasutrashankarabhashya and other works of Shankar with the names of some rulers and locating them in history.

Names of the following rulers are said to have been mentioned by Shankar in his works-Raja Purnavarma, Rajyavarma, Balavarma, Krishnagupta and Jai Singh. A number of modern scholars take these names to be those of rulers. But one is amazed to see that Shankar himself has nowhere given them the epithet of Raja. How then could they be treated as such?

This may be explained by asserting that the name of Purnavarma is clearly preceded by the epithet of Raja. The text there is—

"न हि वन्ध्यापुत्रो राजा बभूव प्राक् पूर्णवर्मणोऽभिषेकादित्येवंजातीयकेन मर्यादाकरणेन निरुपाख्यो वन्ध्यापुत्रो राजा बभूव भवति भविष्यतीति वा विशेष्यते ।[2]

That Vandhyaputra, was the ruler before the coronation of Purnavarma cannot by itself prove the existence of Nirupakhya Vandhyaputra, the ruler. This means that the coronation of some Purnavarma took place and that Shankar, the author of this line was acquainted with this event.

We wish the scholars could critically apply their mind while considering this reference. Acharya Shankar here is trying to

1. See वेदान्तदर्शनेर इतिहास (in Bengali) Vol. I, 2nd Ed. (1372 Bengali era) P.191, by Prajnananda Saraswati Director Varishala Shankar Matha, edited by RajendranathaGhosha.
2. Shankar's commentary of Brahmasutra (2-1-18)

establish his सत्कार्यवाद. In this context the effect घट is said to be non existent before it comes into being. The connection of the effect pot (घट) with its causes leads to its birth. The Acharya questions this assertion of असत्कार्यवादी (believer in the effect not pre-existing in the cause) saying, "how could the relationship of घट be established with its cause before it came into being. A connection is possible between two existing entities but not between two non-existing entities or between two entities of which only one exists while the other does not. The rule of मर्यादाकरण applies to existing objects like the field or the house. This alone cannot help proving the existence of the non existing घट. Establishing the connection of effect घट with its causes before it came into being is like calling a वन्ध्यापुत्र (barren's son) Raja before the coronation of Purnavarma. This only means that the existence of Vandhyaputra (वन्ध्यापुत्र) cannot be proved only by indicating the coronation of Purna varma.

Here the Acharya does not appear to be referring to the coronation of any actual Raja, named Purnavarma. The fact is that the Acharya had in his mind an ordinary name 'Purna'. When he used it in the context of the coronation of a Raja he added 'Varma' to it. At another place[1] the Acharya used this very name Purna for a farm-labourer. There he changed it into Purnaka, adding 'Ka' to give it diminutive form. This makes it clear, that he never intended to use it for any particular Raja, named Purnavarma but only added 'Varma' to a routine name 'Purna' to give it a particular meaning; while at another place he added the suffix 'क' to Purna to express a different meaning there. Shabaraswami also used this word in its feminine gender in his Mimansabhashya (sutra, 1.2.37). It seems that this common word "Purna", in any of its forms, was widely used by ancient commentators alike. It is thus quite obvious that the Acharya did not use the name Purnavarma there for any parti-

1. See Shankar's commentary of Brahmasutra (1.4.15). The text there is
"व्याक्रियत इत्यपि कर्मकर्त्तरि लकारः सत्येव परमेश्वरे व्याकर्त्तरि सौकर्यमपेक्ष्य द्रष्टव्यः । यथा लूयते केदारः स्वयमेवेति सत्येव पूर्णके लवितरि ।"
See Ashtadhyayi (अष्टाध्यायी) 5-3-74,85,86 for various meanings of the Suffix 'क' added to Purva'

cular Raja. As such it is futile on the part of modern scholars to accept Purnavarma as the name of a particular Raja, locate it in history and then fix up Shankar accordingly.

Three names in one Place—

Of the list of names given above as many as three have been mentioned at one place.[1] The text there is

"तथा च लोके प्रसिद्धेष्वप्यातिवाहिकेष्वेवंजातीयक उपदेशो दृश्यते। गच्छ त्वमितो बलवर्माणं ततो जयसिंहं ततः कृष्णगुप्तमिति।"

The movement after death of Spiritualists worshipping सगुण ब्रह्म (Brahma with attributes) is described here. This is uttarayan (उत्तरायण गति) i.e. the way gods (देव) go. The path followed by the soul en route to Brahmaloka and those who lead him on his way-all these details are discussed on the bases of the Chhandogya and other Upanishads. Those who accompany it are named Archi (अर्चि), Aha (अह), Shuklapakasha (शुक्ल पक्ष) etc. Whcever they may be, the path in question has been indicated by naming them. Such is the process, being followed on earth. The Acharya wrote this line only to explain it. The director is advising the person concerned to first to go to Brahma, then to Jai Singh and lastly to Krishnagupta.

Obviously these are ordinary names. Neither the tittle of Raja is attached to them nor is there any indication to show that the author means it. How the modern writers came to treat them as such is not known. As a matter of fact this is a creation of western missionaries. The idea expressed by the author with these names here has been expressed with other names in his commentary of the preceding (4-3-4) aphorism.

Names of places. There it reads as—"

"गच्छेतस्त्वममुं गिरिं ततो न्यग्रोधं ततो नदीं ततो ग्रामं ततो नगरं वा प्राप्स्यसि इति, एवमिहापि-अर्चिषोऽहरह आपूर्यमाणपक्षमित्याद्याह।"

Here the path is indicated by taking Archi etc. to mean places while earlier the same have been treated as living beings. Names of living beings are mentioned there to represent

1. In the commentary of Brahmasutra (4-3-5)

living gods (देवता) while here names of places, mountains, Banyan trees and rivers are mentioned, taking Archi etc. as names of places. From the point of view of places it is said, "First go towards that mountain where you will find a Banyan tree. Then you will come across a river followed by a village and then ultimalely you will reach a city".

If, in the first place, Balavarma etc. are to be regarded as Rajas will it follow that Giri, Nyagrodha, Nadi, Gram and Nagar were their capitals or territories. Truly speaking, such baseless contentions are mere mockery. The scholars of today here are simply enamoured of these so called research scholars of the West on account of their fairy tales. Any ordinary name occurring anywhere in literature is dubbed as the name of a Raja. No serious thought is given to the peculiar use of those names in their proper context. Any name may be given to any individual. Like Devadatta, Yajnadatta etc. Purna, Jaisinha, Krishna Gupta, Balram etc. are so common that thousands of individuals in India today may be found bearing these names. They could as well be found in Shankar's times.

Rajyavarma in the list of names

The name of Rajyavarma is there in the aforesaid list. Rajendrnath Ghosha, an eminent scholar and editor of 'Vedant Darshaner. Itihas' (History of Vedanta Darshan in Bengali) writes at[1] one place "No Raja named Rajyavarma has so far been traced. According to scholars, Rajyaverma, mentioned by the Acharya was Rajyavardhana, elder brother of Harshavardhan. Scribes made Rajyavarman of Rajyavardhan. It is not quite impossible. If the Acharya meant this Rajyavardhan he could not have flourished before 7th Century AD. There is sufficient ground for Rajyavarman being Rajyavardhan. The Acharya has, at one place, spoken of the miserly nature of Purnavarma and generosity of Rajyavardhana. That Purnavarma was a Buddhist and a nominal Raja can be known from Huentsang's account of those days. On the other hand Rajyavardhan is known to have been a great philanthropist and an important Raja, following Hinduism. They were both contemporaries. Therefore, there is every possiblity of Rajayavarman

1. Vol.I, Ed. 2,page 191, para 6.

being Rajyavardhan. In that case the Aharya can never be said to have lived before 7th century AD.[1]"

What Mr. Ghosh wants to suggest is 'that in history there was no Raja named Rajyavarma. But one Rajyavardhan was there. Maybe, the Acharya wrote Rajyavardhan which was made into Rajyavarman by the scribes." This reminds us of what happened in the state of a foolish Raja, Gavargand.

A criminal was sentenced to death by hanging. When he was going to be hanged it was discovered that the noose did not fit in his neck. Raja Gavargand, therefore, ordered that the criminal concerned should be freed but since a man had to be hanged, anybody whose neck could fit in the noose should be brought in his place and hanged. As no Raja named Rajyavarman, is traceable in history at the time when Shankar has to be proved to exist, a Raja must be created and the easiest way to do so is to remove Rajyawarman and replace him arbitrarily by Rajyavardhan so that the desired date of Shankar could be fixed.

How ridiculous are these researches? Let us consider the following situation:—

(a) Where Acharya Shankar has actually mentioned the name of Rajyavarma has not been traced so far. Even Mr. Ghosha has not given any clue.

(b) Even if the name occurs somewhere its declension is not known. The scribe can possibly commit a mistake only when the word is used in the form of राज्यवर्मन. A confusion is possible between वर्मन् and वर्द्धन. If the original word be used in a declension where there can be no similarity in the form of the two words the mistake should be attributed to Mr. Ghosh instead of the scribe. Nothing can be said for certain without looking into the original text which, unfortunately, is still not known. Rajyavarman cannot be transformed into Rajyavarman merely on the suggestion of the so called scholars.

(c) History should also reveal the duration of Rajyavardhan's reign, the extent of his territory and the amount of money spent by him for the welfare of his people. According to history, immediately before Rajyavardhan

1. This is the English version of the original in Bengali.

was to take the reins of government he had to fight against an enemy and was killed. He could not get an opportunity when he could have served his people and shown his generosity.

As such the individual names occuring in Shankar's commentary of Brahmasutras are common names and do not refer to any historical personages. An attempt to fix up Shankar's time on the basis of such names would be wrong and unjust.

Sarvajnatmamuni and his time

It is said that Sarvajnatmamuni, author of "Sankshepa Shariraka' (संक्षेपशारीरक) on Vedant was the disciple of Acharya Sureshwara. But he has given his Guru's name Deveshwara[1] in his

1. In the very beginning we read—

यदीयसम्पर्कमवाप्य केवलं वयं कृतार्था निरवद्यकीर्त्तयः।
जगत्सु ते तारितशिष्यपंक्तयो जयन्ति देवेश्वरपादरेणवः॥ (१-८)

The author ends with—

श्रीदेवेश्वरपादपंकजरजः सम्पर्कपूताशयः,
सर्वज्ञात्मगिराङ्कितो मुनिवरः संक्षेपशारीरकम्।
चक्रे सज्जनबुद्धिमण्डनमिदं राजन्यवंश्ये नृपे,
श्रीमत्यक्षतशासने मनूकुलादित्ये भुवं शासति॥६२॥

In the पुष्पिका or the end of first chapter, the author says—

"इति श्रीदेवेश्वरपूज्यपादशिष्यश्रीसर्वज्ञात्ममहामुनेः कृतौ संक्षेपशारीरके प्रथमोऽध्यायः।"

इति श्रीदेवेश्वरपूज्यपादशिष्यसर्वज्ञात्मभट्टारकमहामुनिविरचिते संक्षेपशारीरके साधनलक्षणं तृतीयोऽध्यायः।

इति श्रीदेवेश्वरपूज्यपादशिष्यसर्वज्ञात्ममहामुनिविरचिते संक्षेपशारीरके फललक्षणं चतुर्थोऽध्यायः।

Ramatirtha, author of अन्वयार्थप्रकाशिका Commentary of संक्षेपशारीरक has thus explained the word श्रीमति—

कदा चक्र इत्यपेक्षायामाह—राजन्यवंश इति क्षत्रिय इत्यर्थः। नृपे राजनि इति यावत्। तस्य नाम निर्दिशति—श्रीमतीति। श्रीमन्नाम्नि, किलक्षणेऽक्षतशासनेऽप्रतिहताज्ञ इत्यर्थः। तस्य राज्ञो वंशतश्च श्रैष्ठयमाह—मनुकुलादित्य इति। मनुवंशप्रकाशक इत्यर्थः एवम्भूते श्रीमन्नाम्नि नृपे भुवं शासति सति सर्वज्ञात्मगिराऽङ्कितो मुनिवरः संक्षेपशारीरकं चक्र इत्यन्वयः।

work. In the very begining he says, "Victory to Deveshwara with whose blessings I, like a host of others, have been able to achieve all that was desired. At the end he says "Sarvajnatmamuni, sanctified by the touch of lotus footed Shri Deveswara, wrote the 'संक्षेपशारीरक' In the पुष्पिका (concluding para) at the end of the first chapter also Sarvajnatmamuni has named his Guru as Deveshwara.

Madhusudana Saraswati, the commentator of संक्षेपशारीरक, has identified Deveshwara with Sureshwara. In his opinion a person wishing well of himself should not directly name his Guru. Therefore the author of 'संक्षेपशारीरक' has used the word देव for सुर.[1] This goes to prove that the author of संक्षेपशारीरक, Sarvajnatmamuni, was the disciple of Acharya Sureshwara, a contemporary of Acharya Shankar. In his बृहदारण्यकोपनिषद्भाष्यवार्तिक-[2] Sureshwar has mentioned the name of Buddhist philosopher Dharmakirti which shows that Dharmakirti was a predecessor of Shankaracharya. Dharmakirti is said to belong to the later part of seventh centuary AD.[3] Consequently Shankar could not exist before the Christian Era.

Errors about Sarvajnatman.

This calls for serious thought. That Sureshwaracharya has mentioned Dharmakirti cannot be denied. That ascertained, Shankar's existence after Dharmakirti becomes a fact. But we can still say that this line of argument is full of fallacies which must be exposed. They are to be examined under the foollowing heads—

(a) Who was this Sarwajanatmamuni.

1. आत्मनाम गुरोर्नाम नामातिकृपणस्य च ।
श्रेयस्कामो न गृहीयाज्ज्येष्ठापत्यकलत्रयोः ॥

2. त्रिष्त्रेव त्वविनाभावादिति यद्धर्मकीर्त्तिना ।
प्रत्यज्ञायि प्रतिज्ञेयं हीयेतासौ न संशयः ॥
(आनन्दाश्रम Ed. Page 15/5, 4-4-753)

3. See "History of Medieval Logic" (Page 100-105) by Dr. Satish Chandra Vidyabhushan and "Manual of Buddhism" by H. Kern (Page 130).

(b) How far is Madhusudan Saraswati's contention about Deveshwar/Sureshwar tenable.

(c) Is there any substance in the controversy about Sarwjnatmamuni's having read out his work to Shankar.

(d) Which Raja, in whose reign he wrote his work, has been referred to by Sarvajnatmamuni.

(e) How far is the date assigned to Dharmakirti correct.

(a) Shri Prajnananand Saraswati says[1] "Sarvajnatmamuni is also known as Nityabodhachrya.[2] Sarvajnatumamuni became head of Shringeri Matha in 758 A.D. He was not a direct disciple of Sureshwaracharya. He appears to be a disciple of another great man, Deveshwaracharya. He took over charge of Shringeri Matha from Deveshwar in 728 A.D. According to old records Sureshwar was head of the Matha from 27 B.C, to 758 or 757 A.D. But this could not be possible. 27 B.C. seems to be definite while 758 A.D. is wrong.

This statement is all fallacious. As a matter of fact Sarvajnatmamuni was never called Nityabodha or Nityabodhghana. Nor did any Sarvajnatmamuni or only Sarvajnatman ever become head of Shringeri Matha. The available list of Acharyas at this Matha begins with Acharya Nityabodhghana. In the literature of Shringeri Matha, including Guruvanshakavya, there is no mention of any Acharya named Sarvajanatman or of Deveshwar.

Contrary to this, Sarvjnatman is the first Acharya after Sureshwara at the Kanchi Kamakoti Peetha where he was inst-

1. Shri Prajnananand Saraswati is the author of वेदान्तदर्शनेर इतिहास in Bengali. According to him Shankar was born in 44 B. C. He has written all this to establish his theory. See Pages 118 to 192 of the book.

2. At page 81 of 'The Truth about the Kambhakonom Mutt' it is said that the name of Acharya as given in गुरुरत्नमालिका is स्थिरबोधघन. As a matter of fact, the correct name is नित्यबोधघन. How नित्य was changed into स्थिर cannot be explained.

alled as such in 2696 Kali era. He discharged his duties as head of that Matha for 42 years i.e. from 406 to 364 B.C. As such it is incompatible to associate Sarvajnatman with Nityabodhghana. This connection between the two, wrongly based as it was, led to several erroneous conclusions with regard to the fixation of time of various Acharyas. After being convinced that Nityabodha or Nityabodhghana was not another name of Sarvajnatman but that they were different persons belonging to different times it becomes clear that Sarvajnatman had nothing to do with the headship of Shringeri Matha.

It has been clearly established in the foregoing pages that Nityabodhghan is the first Acharya in the list of Acharyas of Shringeri Matha as at present available. For quite a few centuries prior to his installation the Matha remained almost in ruins. Long after this-probably several centuries later-the problem of linking the Matha traditionally with Acharya Shankar occupied the mind of the Acharyas of Shringeri Matha. As no historical base could be available (as it is not even today) for the purpose it was considered convenient to add the name of Sureshwar preceded by that of Shankaracharya immediately before the name of the first Acharya Nityabodhaghan in the available list, thereby completing the tradition with Acharya Shankar as the starting point. That is how, in the old records of Shringeri Matha, Sureshwar came to be fixed at near about 800 A.D. This as indicated above by Shri Prajnananand Saraswati and declared inconceivable This was the logical conclusion.

Guru of Sarvajnatman

That Deveshwara or Sureshwara was the Guru of Sarvajnatman is a historically established fact. Sureshwara was connected with Nityabodhaghan, a man who came to the scene 800 years after him. What hitch could be there then to identify him with Sarvajnatman ? Thus two persons belonging to different times were named into one. Obviously Sarvajnatman was in no way associated with the Shringeri Matha. To identify Sarvajnatman with Nityabodh or Nityabodhaghan is absolutely wrong.

(b) *Deveshwar, Guru of Sarvajnatman*

Sarvajnatman has, in his work संक्षेपशारीरक named his guru

as Deveshwar.[1] Madhusudan Saraswati says that here Deveshwar had been used to mean Sureshwara. देव has been substituted for सुर[2] because the scriptures[3] ordain that the name of Guru should not be pronounced as it is.

Another view in this connection is that this was probably done to fit into the meter. Because of an additional vowel (दीर्घ instead of ह्रस्व) in देवेश्वर this could fit in better. But this suggestion does not hold good ; for in the पुष्पिका also [11]at the end of a chapter which does not involve any meter the name देवेश्वर has been used. The suggestion made by Madhusudan Saraswati appears to be comparatively more tenable. But if देवेश्वर had to be used once for the sake of meter it might have had to be used again for the sake of uniformity. In that case the second suggestion also cannot be easily discarded. Ramatirtha Swami, another commentator of संक्षेपशारीरक also, agreeing with Madhusudan Saraswati, admitted the possibility of Deveshwar (देवेश्वर) having been used for Sureshwara (सुरेश्वर) in देवेश्वरपादरेणव: But Shri Prajnananand Saraswati does not agree with Madhusudan Saraswati. In his opinion Deveshwar, and not Sureshwar, was the immediate guru of Sarvajnatman. Thus, according to Shri Prajnanananda, Sureashwara and Deveshwara were two different persons.

Maybe, the Bengali author, by doing so, aims at bridging the long gap of about 800 years betwen Sureshwaracharya and Nityabodhaghanacharya of Shringeri Matha. With that aim in view he introduces Deveshwar in between Sureshwar and Nityabodhghana, also known as Sarvajnatman and asserts that Sarvajnatman took over as head of Shringeri Matha from

---

1. यदीय सम्पर्कमवाप्य केवलं वयं कृतार्थां निरवद्यकीर्त्तयः ।
जगत्सु ते तारितशिष्यपंक्तयो जयन्ति देवेश्वरपादरेणवः ।।1।8।।

2. 'सुर' पदस्थाने 'देव' पदप्रयोगः साक्षाद्गुरोर्नाम नगृह्णीयादिति स्मृतः ।

3. आत्मनाम गुरोर्नाम नामातिकृपणस्य च ।
श्रेयस्कामो न गृह्णीयाज्ज्येष्ठापत्यकलत्रयोः ।।

(अज्ञातमूलस्थानमिदं पद्यम् । आभाणकरुपेण परम्परया प्रचलति) ।

Deveshwaracharya in 758 A.D.[1] There must have been many more unknown Acharyas in the intervening period. Else, how could the gap of nearly 800 years between Sureshwar and Sarvajnatman be filled in.

The Gap between Nityabodhghana and Sureshwara

That there is no Acharya named Sarvajnatman in the order of Acharyas of Shringeri Peetha has already been made clear. To identify Nityabodhaghanacharya with Sarvajnatman is fallacious. Sarvajnatman is the first Acharya of Kanchi Kamakoti Peetha after Sureshwara as shown in the list of Acharyas there. The intervening period between Acharya Nityabodhghan, the first Acharya of Shringeri Matha in the list of Acharyas ot present available and Sureshwaracharya comes to about 1250 years and not 800 years. This is confirmed by the records of Dwaraka and other Mathas.

Not naming the Guru, only sentiment

Sarvajnatma, instead of directly naming his Guru Sureshwar, chose to call him Deveshwar. There is nothing wrong with it, although many a scholar has mentioned the actual name of their Gurus in their works. This is to everybody's liking. Some did not think it proper while others saw nothing wrong in it. It should have been discussed if it had any historical implications. The context in which the Smritees prohibited the naming of Guru has also to be looked into. Mentioning of one's own name is also disallowed there but this has been done by the author himself in the same shloka. There is nothing wrong in telling one's name or that of his Guru when asked to do so. This is, therefore, nothing but play of sentiments. No other person with Deveshwar as his name is known in history. As such there is no difficulty in admitting Madhusudan's suggestion.

The time of Sarvajnatman and Sureshwar is of special significance in determining Shankar's time. We have already

1. In fact 758 A.D. is the year of initiation of Nityabodhaghanacharya into sanyas. At page 253 of "काशी में कुम्भघोण मठ विषयक विवाद" a work relating to the Shringeri Matha it is stated about the said Acharya—"Initiated into Sanyas-ashrama in 757 A.D. and installed as Acharya in 773 A.D." Sarvajnatman is in no way connected with this Acharya.

dwelt at length on Sureshwara in the beginning of this chapter. The time of Sarvajnatman has to be considered. Although his time is already decided according to the traditions of Mathas but the modern method of critical study tends to create several hurdles which have to be viewed in thetr proper perspective.

The basis for determining the time of Sarvajnatman

Sarvajnatmamuni has, towards the end of his work संक्षेपशारीरिक, thus indicated his time in the following shloka :

श्री देवेंश्वरपादपंकजरज:सम्पर्कपूताश्रय:,
सर्वज्ञात्मगिरांकितो मुनिवर: संक्षेपशारीरकम् ।
चक्रे सज्जनबुद्धिमण्डनमिदं राजन्यवंशे नृपे,
श्रीमत्यक्षतशासने मनुकुलादित्ये भुवं शासति ॥

The first stanza of the shloka contains the name of his Guru (देवेश्वर), and the second one his own name (सर्वंज्ञात्ममुनि) and that of this work (संक्षेपशारीरक). In the remaining two stanzas is given the name of some Kshatrya Raja in whose reign he wrote his work. This Raja has not yet been identified. Scholars differ here.

The greatest difficulty in determining the time of Sarvajnatman lies in his being identified with Nityaboadhaghan of Shringeri Matha. That these are two different persons belonging to different times has been made amply clear. The above quoted shloka should be discussed, keeping this fact in view.

Swami Prajnananand's opinion about the time of Sarvajnatman

Shri Prajnananand Saraswati interpreted the word श्रीमती in the shloka to mean 'one possessed of Shri or Lakshmi or the husband of Lakshmi'. With this interpretation he took Lakshmipati (लक्ष्मीपति) to stand for Vishnu, Narayana or Krishna and assumed that it referred to Krishna, the first Raja of Rashtrakuta dynasty who ruled from 769 to 780 A. D. Sarvajnatman was a contemporary of this very Raja in whose reign he wrote his' संक्षेपशारीरक[1].

1 . See वेदान्तदर्शनेर इतिहास Vol. I Ed. 2, P. 133-135

The above interpretation of the word 'श्रीमति' is quite far fetched and baseless. Identifying Sarvajnatma with Nityabodhaghana of Shringeri Peetha, the Swami has tried in vain to place him (Nityabodhaghana) earlier. The fact remains that the author has neither hinted at any period of time nor pointed towards any such Raja.

The shloka is silent on the place where he wrote his work. The Swami thinks that the work (संक्षेपशारीरक) was written at Shringeri. But the name of Sarvajnatma appears after Sureshwara in the list of Acharyas of Kanchi Kamakoti Peetha. This leads to the idea of its having been written at Kanchi. In which part of the country the said Pratham Krishna ruled need also be ascertained. There is not much difference between the time of Shankar and that of Sarvajnatma, disciple of Sureshwara. In the केरलीयशंकरचरित we read that Acharya Shankar belonged to Kochin State which was then ruled by Rajaraja (राजराजा). On his death soon, Rajashekhar succeeded him. He was a contemporary ot Acharya Shankar.[1]

According to शंकरचरित at Kamakoti Peetha, Rajasen is said to be ruling Kanchi during Shankar's stay there[2] In those days there used to be mostly petty territorial rulers. There is no doubt about present Kanchi being what it used to be in Shankar's time. There is no doubt also about Kanchi being outside Kochin state. That even then these were two different states is clear from thc different names of the then rulers as described in Shankar's biographies. At what time and on which part of the south 'Krishna' of Rashtrakuta dynasty ruled must be ascertained. Whether the places associated with Shankar fall in his territorial jurisdiction is not yet certain. Can it be taken for granted that Shankar's birth place, Shringeri Peetha and Kanchi fell in the domain of one ruler, Krishna. In particular, it is necessary to ascertain the Raja in whose territory Kanchi Kamakoti associated with Sarvajnatmamuni fell. According to history Krishna of Rashtrakuta dynasty ruled over parts of the south around the present Aurangabad city. Ajanta and

1. Based on the Hindi version by Baldev Upadhyaya of माधवीय शंकरदिग्विजय, Apd. (क) page 585.
2. Ibid. P. 582.

Ellora fell in his jurisdiction. A few territorial rulers were under his (Krishna's) influence but the rulers of Chola, Pandya and Kerala were quite independent. The Shringeri Matha and the institution of Kanchi Kamakoti were absolutely out of the territorial jurisdiction of Krishna. In these circumstances it will not be correct to say that Sarvajnatma was referring to this Krishna of Rashtrakut dynasty. Taking श्रीमति in the shloka to mean this Raja makes the above contention still more absurd.

Rajendranath Ghosha on the time of Sarvajnatma

According to shri Rajendranath Ghosha[1] Aditya (आदित्य) in the compound word मनुकुलादित्ये in the shloka of संक्षेपशारीरक referred to Aditya Verma (आदित्यवर्मा) a Raja of Chalukya dynasty. He says "Vikramark I of Chalukya dynasty had a brother, Aditya Verma. He ruled over Shringeri etc. Harihar was his capital. This is known from a rock inscription.[2] Pandit Ramakrishna Bhandarkar is also of the same opinion. The Chalukya dynasty with a number of Rajas with आदित्य as their title makes it quite safe.

Being the 14th year of Vikramark (विक्रमार्क) in Shankar's time

1. As Sanyasi Shri Ghosh Babu's name is Chidghananand Saraswati. He has edited the second edition of वेदान्तदर्शनेर-इतिहास whose author Swami Prajnananand Saraswati has determined 44 B. C. as Shankar's date of birth. He has based it on some old record wherein 14th year of Vikramark era (विक्रमार्कअब्द) has been given as Shankar's time. In his capacity as editor, Ghosh Babu has given his comments on almost all the testimony collected by Swami Prajananand Saraswati in support of his contention. We have based our findings here on them. See footnotes at page 133 and 135. Vol. I, ed. 2. For the last portion see footnote at page 126.
2. Mr. Ghosha has given no clue to the inscription on which he has based his findings. Such evidence should be examined in the light of the traditions of Dwarka and other Peethas.

Sarvajnatmamuni's time fits in like that of Sureshwara. From all counts we have determined Shankar's time as 686 A. D. If he is placed in 44 B. C. it is surprising that Huentsang and Itsing made no mention of him".

Criticism of Ghosha's opinion

We find that the inference of Adityavarma from the said shloka is as baseless as the previous one. Adityavarma did rule over Shringeri etc. But there is no evidence for Sarvajnatmamuni's connection with the Shringeri Peetha. No reference has been provided for the inscription. If more than one person say something which is false, it may get circulated but it cannot thereby become true. The word. आदित्य in मनुकुलादित्ये is expressive of lustre or elegance. It only means that that Raja shone in मनुकुल like the sun. There is no reason why it should be treated as a title or proper name. This is certainly an attempt for perpetuating one's prejudices based on some wrong notion. By placing Shankar in the 14th year of Vikramark of Chalukya not only does the time of Sureshwar and Sarvajuatman get disturbed but the traditions of all the Mathas of Acharya are also effaced. How can their being linked arbitrarily with the Rajas of their creation stand the test of logic?

Shankar, Sureshwar and Sarvajnatma are all contemporaries. Sureshwar is the eldest of them. Shankar was the first to die, followed by Sureshwara. After Sureshwara's death Sarvajnatma remained Acharya of Kanchi Kamakoti Peetha. We have just said on the basis of Shankar's biographies that Acharya Shankar was born in Kochin State and Shringeri Peetha, now in Tamil Nadu was then in Kochin. Rajashekar was its Raja in Shankar's time. Sarvajnatma, associated with[1] Kachhi Kamakoti Peetha, could have made a reference to the then Raja of the State. The emergence of Adityavarma of Chalukya dynasty from Sarvajnatma's Shloka is in contradiction of all facts.

1. The association of Sarvajnatma with the Shringeri Matha in known from these writers only. Shri Prajnananand Sarasvati and Shri Chidghananand Saraswati (Mr. Ghosh) have tried to connect Sarvajnatman with the Shringeri Matha. But this is absolutely wrong. His association with Kanchi Kamakoti is confirmed on the basis of the records of the various Mathas.

Why Shankar's time not before Christian Era

According to Mr. Ghosh, if Shankar is placed before the Christian Era there is no reason why the Chinese pilgrims, Huentsang and Itsing should not mention him. This means that their writings must have contained a reference about Shankar and that the absence of such a reference clearly proves that Shankar was born after these pilgrims had visited India.

A question may be asked—should all those who did not find a place in their writings be considered posterior to these pilgrims? The answer may be given that if not all, a reference to at least those Acharyas who had gone before them and who had either agreed with them or had strongly opposed them and whose literature they might have come across must have been mentioned by them. Since no such thing happened, it may be safely concluded that neither Shankar nor his literature had been a reality by that time.

Huentsang and Shankar

The Chinese pilgrims had obviously come to this country with the avowed purpose of studying Buddhism and its literature.[1] Therefore they recorded only those persons and events which were relevant to them while working on their

1. On being asked by Acharya Sheelabhadra of Nalanda Huentsang said, "My sole purpose in visiting India was to study religious books for the benefit of my countrymen" A similar statement was made by him when be met Raja Shiladitya—"Huentsang had come all the way to acquaint himself with the scriptures. He wished to study Yogashastra." Chinese Pilgrim Huentsang by Samual Beel (English) Hindi translation by Satyajivan Verma, Pub. by Sharada Press Allahabad, 1942—See page 170 & 175. See also page 226, Pub. 1929 by Indian Press Ltd.

project. Since this is considered to be an important factor in determining the time of Shankar it becomes imperative to sift the details given by them.

1. We have, before us, the accounts of the travels of those pilgrims. Instead of giving an account of the rise and fall of Buddhism in India at that time they have given a detailed account of the destruction of the various monastries and the deterioration of Buddhism in several ways. Quite a few territorial rulers gave Huentsang state honour becoming a religious leader. At some places literary discourses were also held. A detailed account of these appears to have been incorporated with a view to enhancing the prestige and influence of Buddhism. These accounts do contain some references about the study of and writing about Buddhism. An attempt has been made there to establish the superiority of Buddhism and inferiority of other religions. Besides, more than half the book is full of the account of travels and anecdots about miracles based on superstitions and blind faith.

2. References during literary discussions were made to Sankhya, Mimansa, Vyakarana etc. but names of their authors were never mentioned. Amongst the grammarians the name of Panini alone has been mentioned, all Buddhist grammarians having been left out. A number of Buddhist philosophers have also been ignored. We are referring here to those Acharyas only who admittedly belong to pre-Huentsang[1] period. Should all of them, by the same logic, be declared to belong to post Huentsang period ? There is, in fact, no substance in this argument.

The greatest attraction for Huentsang's visiting India was its being the birth-place of Lord Buddha. This was the time of the decline of Buddhism which never survived thereafter.

1. Mostly Acharyas belonging to their own sect have been mentioned Rarely any name from amongst the aliens has ben mentioned. Why should we then expect Shankar being named ? Even from amongst their own men, the names of Aryadeva, Kumarjiva, Buddhapalit, Chandrakirti, Dinnaga etc. are not mentioned.

Acharya Shankar lived much earlier when practically all the rulers and their people were under the influence of Buddhism. According to the biographical data of the Acharya he proved his relevance in those times. Those who assign him to the 7th or 8th Century A.D. do not view things from all aspects.

Huentsang and his study of Vedant

It is simply ridiculous to presume that there was no such thing as the study and teaching of Vedant or the Shankar School of Vedant before the sixth or 7th century only because Huentsang has not mentioned it anywhere. The Chinese pilgrim was a follower of the Mahayan Sect of Buddhism. Naturally he devoted himself to the study of the scriptures of that sect with greater ferver. He has openly condemned even Hinayan Buddhism. There is no evidence to show that he was equally interested in the study of all scriptures. Why, then should he have necessarily mentioned Vedant and its Acharyas, particularly Shankar. Obviously he mentioned only what he studied or came across incidently. The usual practice at that time had been for the scholars to study the literature of their own sect only. To a great extent this persists even today. While arriving at a certain conclusion on the basis of the accounts of the pilgrims the sentiments which motivated them to visit this country must be taken into consideration. The study and teaching of Vedant and its various branches is quite old.

(c & d) Consequent upon these details, the inference of the names of Krishnaverma or Adityaverma from the said shloka of Sarvajnatma and the संक्षेपशारीरक having been written in their time is all mere imagination. All this is based on the presumption that Acharya Nityabodhghana of the Shringeri Peetha was the same person as Sarvajnatma. In fact Sarvajnatma was the first Acharya of Kanchi Kamakoti Peetha and not that of Shringeri. He was the immediate successor of Sureshwara there. But Nityabodhaghana headed the Shringeri Peetha nearly 1180 years after Sureshwara. That during this long interval Shringeri Peetha remained in ruins has already been made clear. There is nothing wrong with संक्षेपशारीरक having

been read out to Shankar. The position becomes anomalous only when Nityabodhghana is identified with Sarvajnatma.

Basing on Indian literature, Pandit Kota Venkatachal Pakayaji has given a detailed account of the Rajas of Andhra dynasty. According to him[1] Acharya Shankar was born during the reign of Arishta Satakarni, the eighteenth ruler in succession in the Andhra dynasty. Maharaja Arishta ruled for 25 years[2] from 519 to 494 B.C. Thereafter Hal Satakarni and Mandalaka ruled for ten years only i.e. from 494 to 484 B.C. Maharaja Purindrasen ruled over Andhra for 21 years—from 484 to 463 B.C. Acharya Shankar died during this period. Born in 509 B.C. he passed away in 477 B.C, His life span was thus nearly 32 years and 6/7 months, The possibility of संक्षेपशारीरिक having been written in the reign of Maharaja Purindrasen cannot be ruled out. Sarvajnatma seems to have referred to him in the said shloka. The influence of the then rulers of Andhra stretched over to the farthest regions of south. That this dynasty was an offshoot of the famous Suryavansha is well known.

From what has been stated above it is clear that the time of Shankar cannot be determined on the basis of the time assigned to Sarvajnatma which is itself inferred from the mention of the names of other rulers said to have been indicated in the said shloka of संक्षेपशारीरक. Sarvajnatmamuni has, for reasons known to him, given the name of Deveshwara instead of Sureshwara. This name is neither to be found elsewhere in history nor has it been used anywhere for Sureshwara; although another name—Vishvarup has been used for Sureshwara.[3] Consequently it will be futile to presume the existence of Deveshwara as a person different from Sureshwara. The time of Sarvajnatmamuni can unmistakably be fixed according to the traditions of the Mathas. And that is in the beginning of the 4th Century B.C.

1. Page 178-197 of "Chronology of Ancient Hindu History" Vol. I, pub. Gandhinagar Vijayawad, 5051 Kali era or 1957 A. D.
2. Ibid P. 192.
3. See विवरणप्रमेयसंग्रह by Vidyaranya Vijayanagar Series Edition P. 49.

(e) That the so called time of Dharmakirti in the 6th or 7th century A.D. is absolutely wrong has already been discussed[1].

Is Bhatta Kumaril posterior to Shankar

Swami Prajnananand Saraswati, in his वेदान्त दर्शनेर इतिहास says [2]"During his reference to or criticism of the doctrine of Mimansasutra in his 'Vedantasutra bhashya' Shankar has always quoted Shabarswami or the Mimansasutra but never Kumarilbhatta. The version of Mimansa[3] given by Shankar on the Vedantasutra (1-1-4) has been attributed to Kumarilabhatta[4] by Anandagiri and Govindanand in their commentaries—'Nyayanirnaya' and 'Ratnaprabha' respectively. But here both these commentators have gone wrong. Vachaspati never mentioned it in his Bhamati. He has simply 'said—उपसंहरति तस्मादिति' Anandagiri and Govindanand are both not very remote persons. They have only explained things without caring for their historical aspect.

If Acharya Shankar had come across the works of Kumrilbhatta before writing his commentary on the Vedantasutura he must have referred to them here and there in his works. Shankar has referred to 'Shabarswami' and 'Upavarsha' by name.[5] The reference to the version of Mimansa can, therefore, be rightly attributed to Shabarswami but not to Kumarilbhatta. As such Kumaril will have to be assigned to a period after Shankar'.

1. See 14th Chapter and the topic of Sureshwara.
2. See pages 142.147 of the work under referece.
3. "न क्वचिदपि वेदवाक्यानां विधिसंस्पर्शमन्तरेणार्थवत्ता दृष्टोपपन्ना वा। न च परिनिष्ठते वस्तुस्वरूपे विधिः संभवति, क्रियाविषयत्वाद्विधेः। तस्मात् कर्मापेक्षितकर्तृस्वरूपदेवतादिप्रकाशनेन क्रियाविधिशेषत्वं वेदान्तानाम्। अथ प्रकरणान्तरभयान्नैतदभ्युपगम्यते, तथापि स्ववाक्यगतोपासनादिकम-परत्वम्, तस्मान्न ब्रह्मणः शास्त्रयोनित्वमिति प्राप्ते उच्यते—" (1-1-4)
4. Anandagiri—'वार्त्तिककारमतमुपसंहरति—तस्मादिति'। Govindananda—'भाट्टमतमुपसंहरति—तस्मादिति।'
5. See Shankar's commentary of Brahmasutra (3'3.53)

Swami Prajnananand fears that by placing Kumaril before Shankar, the latter will have to be placed after Dharma kirti. Kumaril is said to be a contemporary of Dharmakirti who, according to scholars holding this view, belonged to the 7th century A.D. The portions of Vedantabhashya of Shankar on the basis of whose comparison with those of Dharmakirti Shankar has been placed after Dharmakirti may not have been written in the light of Dharmakirti's views ; but the same cannot be said in the case of Kumaril whose writings clearly bear out[1] that he was familiar with Dharmakirti. In that case if Kumaril is admitted to be prior to or a contemporary of Shankar the mere fact that Kumrail knew Dharmakirti will place Shankar after Dharmakirti even though Shankar himself may not have mentioned him. This situation is not acceptable to Swami Prajnananand. Hence this proposition.

Rectification of History

But this contention gives rise to several other difficulties. Firstly, even though Shankar did not mention the name of Dharmakirti or quote from him he had clearly quoted a passage[2] from Dinnaga. Dinnaga is said to have existed a little before the so called agreed time of Dharmakirti.[3] How could then

1. But so far no evidence is available in the writings of Kumaril to show that he was posterior to Dharmakirti. The प्रत्यक्षलक्षण of Buddhist Philosophy as given in Sloka 137 of श्लोकवार्तिक is not the same as given by Dharmakirti because it does not contain the word अभ्रान्त. No other reference to his acquaintance with Dharmakirti is available anywhere in the whole of Kumaril's. वार्त्तिक
2. In Shankar's commentary of Brahmasutra (2.2.28) we read "अतश्चैवमेव सर्वे लौकिका उपलम्भन्ते यत्प्रत्याचक्षाणा अपि बाह्यार्थमेव व्याचक्षते—'यदन्तर्ज्ञेयरूपं तद् बहिर्वदवभासते' इति ।"
The sixth verse in Dinnag's आलम्बनपरीक्षा is यदन्तर्ज्ञेयरूपं तु बाहिर्वदवभासते' ।
3. Dharmakirti's time is said to bc the first half of the 7th Century A. D. while that of Dinnaga the latter half of 5th Century A. D.

Shankar be placed in the first century A.D. as pleaded by Swami Prajananand Saraswati ?[3]

As a matter of fact Shankar's time on the basis of the relevant material at the Matha's established by him is about the 5th century B.C. But to combat with the hurdles created by missionary scholars, arguments like the one put forth above do not carry much weight. More problems are created than solved by doing so. The root cause lies elsewhere. It has to be dug deep and extricated. The disease cannot be cured by applying extraneous routine methods. The root cause is the so called calculated time of Buddhist philosophers and other important allied persons. We will have to correct their dates which are all doubtful. A review of the order of the dynasties of those days is also called for. This has to be done from the Indian point of view, in conformity with Indian traditions and placing reliance on purely Indian resources.

From what has been stated so far it is clear that there is a difference of nearly 12-13 centuries between the old and the new. We will have to dismiss the idea that the all round progress being witnessed now began with the birth of Christ. Nobody can deny modern achievements. Our only concern is the presentation of historical truth. We will have to unsheath the facts enveloped by wrong notions. It will be necessary to sift all evidence afresh. We will then see that Shankar was engaged in the criticism of Buddhist philosophers as early as 5th Century B.C. There is no confusion about it. We will neither have to put Kumaril after Shankar nor worry about Sureshwar.

Sureshwar and Dharmakirti

By putting Kumaril after Shankar, Swami Prajananand probably thought that there would be no difficulty now in placing Shankar before the Christian Era. But how could we then explain the mention of Dharamakirti's name in 'Brihadaranya-

1. Swami Prajnanand Saraswati has tried to fix 44 B. C. as Shankar's year of birth. See वेदान्तदर्शनेरइतिहास Vol. I, 2nd edition page 118-192.

Kabhashyawartika'[1] by Sureshwar who was definitely a pre-contemporary of Shankar. Swamiji has failed to give any convincing explanation. He only says that Sureshwar, while discussing this very doctrine of Buddhism elsewhere,[2] has not mentioned Dharmakirti's name. He has mentioned Shakya Bhiksu only. But what is wrong with Dharmakirti being given the name of Shakyabhiksu ? Again, how shall we explain the name wherever it has been used ? Shri Swamiji has explained it away by saying that Dharmakirti referred to by Sureshwar was a different person from the famous Dharmakirti. There have been more than one person, bearing the same name.[3]

How far this presumption is historically tenable needs serious consideration. The fact remains that Dharmakirti who was a contemporary of Sureshwar or lived earlier was none else but the famous Dharmakirti.[4] The only difference is that the time assigned to him today is incorrect. He should be placed really where a different Dharmakirti is being created. As a matter of fact all that has been arbitrarily made out by modern scholars will have to be placed in its true perspective where no presumptions or suppositions will be called for.

Kumaril not posterior to Shankar :

Besides these two difficulties[5] arising from Swamiji's said

1. See under reference, Anandashrama Poona Ed. Shloka 4-4-753, page 1515, The Vartika reads as—
   त्रिष्वेव त्वविनाभावादिति यद्धर्मकीर्त्तिना ।
   प्रत्यज्ञायि प्रतिज्ञेयं हीयेतासौ न संशयः ॥
2] Ibid Shloka 4-3-781, poge 1523. The reading there is as follows—
   त्रिष्वेव त्वविनाभावादिति योक्ता प्रयत्नतः ।
   प्रतिज्ञार्थस्य संत्यागो न युक्तः शाक्यभिक्षुभिः ॥
3. See वेदान्तदर्शनेर इतिहास Vol. I 2nd ed. page 186-187.
4. The statement of Dharmakriti quoted by Sureshwaracharya in his बृहदारण्यकोपनिषद्भाष्यवार्त्तिक (Poona Edition, 4.4.753, P.1515) is found in न्यायबिन्दु of the famous Dharmakirti. Why then try to create another Dharmakirti.
5. One-Shankar's quoting from आलंबन परीक्षा of Dinnaga. Two-Sureshwar's mention of Dharmakirti by name.

proposition yet another problem is created thereby. The various theories of Mimansa enunciated by Shankar in his commentaries of Vedant are all based on Shabarswami and not on Kumarilbhatta. Does it mean that Kumarilbhatta differed from Shabarswami ? The fact is that they held identical views. On whom Shankar based his writings could be decided according to the difference of opinion. If on certain other counts Kumaril could be proved posterior to Shankar, it could be said that Shankar's writings were not based on him. On the other hand all traditions and writings speak loudly of Kumaril's being a pre-contemporary of Shankar.

We do not mean to say that the writings of Shankar on Mimansa were based on the writings of Kumaril. There is nothing wrong in admitting that Shankar based his writings on Shabarswami. But that alone cannot make Kumaril posterior to Shankar. May-be, Shankar did not think it proper to give that much importance to the writings of Kumaril because of his being his own contemporary. Kumaril's recognition as posterior to Shankar is, therefore, no solution of any problem.

There is nothing wrong with the commentators[1] of Shankarbhashya, saying that the theories of Mimansa quoted and discussed by Shankar were those of Kumaril, May-be, Shankar quoted from the works of Shabarswami, but the commentators attributed the same to Kumaril. This does not, however, affect historical sequence. Even in the absence of such a contention Kumarilbhatta could not have been proved posterior to Shankar. There is no evidence available to put Shankar before Kumaril.

There is no evidence in Kumaril's writings to show that his discussion of Vedant[2] is based on any work of Shankar.

1. See Ratnaprabha and Anandgiri conmentaries on अवतरणिका भाष्य of Brahmasutra (1.1.4)
2. Kumarilbhatta in श्लोकवार्तिक (Sutra 5, सम्बन्धाक्षेप परिहार Shloka 84-86, Chawkhamba edition, P. 663) writes-
   स्वय च शुद्धरूपत्वादसत्त्वाच्चान्यवस्तुनः ।
   स्वप्नादिवदविद्यायाः प्रवृत्तिस्तस्य किंकृता ॥
   अन्येनोपप्लवेऽभीष्टे द्वैतवादः प्रसज्यते ।
   स्वाभाविकीमविद्यां तु नोच्छेत्तं कश्चिदर्हति ॥
   विलक्षणोपपाते हि नश्येत् स्वाभाविकी क्वचित् ।
   न त्वेकात्माऽभ्युपायानां हेतुरस्ति विलक्षणः ॥

This thinking in the from of Vedant had existed long before the birth of Shankar who only tried to take it to its logical end. That Kumaril's discussion of the subject relates to the theory of Vedant as it prevailed before Shankar can be accepted without any fear of contradiction. In the presence of the historical and other data available Kumaril will continue to be a pre-contemporary of Shankar. Swami Prajnananand Saraswati is critical of the commentators of Shankarbhashya that they were led astray and only explained things at the cost of history. But as a matter of fact Swamiji himself has erred here and thus distorted historical facts. His treatment of Kumaril is full of incongruities.

As a result of all this discussion the age of Shankar is fixed at 509 B.C. But the greatest hurdle is put by the inscriptions of Ashoka in Aremenian script. We shall discuss it in a subsequent chapter.

Hariswami, the commentator of Shatapatha Brahman, has thus indicated his time in the beginning of the commentary—

यदाब्दानां कलेर्जग्मुः सप्त त्रिशच्छतानि वै ।
चत्वारिंशत्समाश्चान्यास्तदा भाष्यमिदं कृतम् ।।

This commentary was written when Kali had completed 7+3000+40=3047 years. The conjunction of the words सप्त-त्रिशच्छतानि here has been long disputed. Quite a few of the scholars calculate the time by treating them as two separate words सप्त and त्रिशंच्छातानि as done by us above. There are others who take them to be one word सप्तत्रिशंच्छतानि, and calculate the time as 3700+40+3740 years. The difference in the two calculations comes to 593 years which is so big as to call for critical examination to find out the truth. To determine whether it is one word or these are two separate words, we have to refer to what the author says about himself in the beginning of the Commentary. He observes os follows—

श्रीमतोऽवन्तिनाथस्य विक्रमार्कस्य भूपतेः ।
धर्माध्यक्षो हरिस्वामी व्याख्याच्छातपथीं श्रुतिम् ।

This means that Hariswami, the commentator of Shatapatha Brahman, was head of the ecclesiastical department of

Vikramarka (Vikramaditya), the king of Ujjain. It is the same Vikramaditya after whom the Virkrama Era was instituted.[1] If 'सप्त' and 'त्रिशच्छतानि' be interpreted as one word, 3740 Kali coincides with (3740-3102=) 638 A. D. We have no trace of any king called Vikramaditya with his capital at Ujjain at that time. But if they are treated as two separate words, the problem is solved. In that case 3047 kali year coincides with (3102-3047) 55 B. C. which is the time when Vikramaditya actually existed and the Vikram Samvat commenced.

The absence of any such king in Ujjain in the beginning of the 7th century A. D. made Dr. Lakshmanaswarup change the reading of the original Shloka. He substituted षट्त्रिंशतच्छतकानि for सप्तत्रिशच्छतानि[2] and suggested the name of Yashodharman as king of Ujjain who had defeated Mihirakula. Nobody has the authority to change the author's reading to suit his whim. Granting that freedom would be tampering with the very basic structure of history. By no stretch of imagination can सप्त and त्रिशंच्छतानि be interpreted as one word.

Thus the date of Hariswami falls somewhere in the middle of the 1st century B. C. and that is the time of the commencement of the Vikrama Era. In the beginning of his commentary Hariswami has made a reference to Prabhakara, the author of Brihati, a commentary on this Shabar Bhashya on mimamsa. Hariswami writes—

"अथवा सूत्राणि यथाविध्युद्देश इति प्राभाकराः । अपः प्रणयतीति यथा ।"

---

1. It may be out of place here to discuss the objections raised against this Era. It may suffice to say that according to Indian traditions there was at that time a king named Vikramaditya whose capital was at Ujjain. It is absolutely wrong to say that this Samvat was originally called Malavagana Samvat and that the name Vikrama was subsequently added to it. The fact is that the Malavagana Samvat was in use before the commencement of the Vikrama Samvat which is known as such from its very beginning.
2. See introduction, P. 54-57 of Lahore edition of the commentary of Nirukta by Skand Maheshwar.

Hariswami's mention of Prabhakara establishes the precedence of Prabhakara over Hariswami. That Prabhakara and Shankaracharya were contemporaries is not disputed by any one. Prabhakara and Mandanmishra were among the disciples of Kumaril Bhatta. While Shankaracharya was entering the field, Kumarila Bhatta was nearing his end. That makes them contemporaries. All this confirms 509 B. C. as the date of Shankaracharya.

Even if 'सप्त त्रिशच्छतानि' were to be interpreted as one word, Hariswami would be placed in the beginning of the 7th Century. Accordingly, Prabhakar, who preceded him could be pushed back to 6th century at the most. In that case Shankara will also have to be bracketed with him in the 6th century. In no case can the theory of modern scholars fixing the end of 8th century for Shankara hold good.[1]

The shloka of Hariswami quoted above creates a difficult position for those who place Shankar in the 8th century. To overcome this difficulty, Dr. Ganganath Jha has severed Prabhakara from Kumarila Bhatta. To do so he has tried to prove that Prabhakara preceded Kumaril Bhatta.[2] Dr. Jha has pleaded his case as follows :—

1. Kumarils' Tantravartika appears to have been written in a new style, abounding in the use of इतिचेन्न and स्यादेतत् Prabhakara in his Brihati, seldom makes use of any of these.

2. The style of writing of one is different from that of the other, even-though the theme of both is the same. Brihati thus shows distinct signs of being older than the Tantravartika. Consequently Prabhakar must be placed earlier than Kumarila.

3. The relation between Prabhakara and Kumarila is only indicated by tradition, it is not based on historical evidence.

---

1. This is due to the fact that the Shringeri Matha had remained in ruins for almost 700 years and when it was rehabilitated, the date of renovation was confused with the date of its origin. The time of revival of Shringeri Matha must not be accepted as the date of its establishment earlier.
2. 'The Prabhakara School of Purva Mimansa' P. 7-17

4. While Kumarila frequently criticises the opinion of Prabhakara, the latter does so only once, and that too where the words used by Prabhakara are different from those employed by Kumarila.

How far these arguments go is something which needs to be critically examined.

1. This is a lame argument for determining the priority or otherwise of an author. There is no point of time to demarcate the period between free and rare use of certain words or phrases. We find the words इति चेन्न used at a number of places in our Darshanas. For instance :—

न्यायदर्शन :

1. सेनावनवद्ग्रहणमिति चेन्न अतीन्द्रियत्वादणूनाम् ॥2।1।36॥
2. असत्यर्थे नाभाव इति चेन्न अन्यलक्षणोपपत्तेः ॥2।2।9॥

मीमांसादर्शन :

1. लोकवदिति चेन्न पूर्वत्वात् ॥1।2।20-21॥
2. चोदनाऽपूर्वकत्वादेकदेश इति चेन्न प्रकृतेरशास्त्रनिष्पत्तेः ॥3।3।21-23॥
3. वैगुण्यान्नेति चेन्न काम्यत्वात् ॥6।1।29-30॥

वेदान्तदर्शन :

1. विकारशब्दान्नेति चेन्न प्राचुर्यात् ॥1।1।13॥
2. छन्दोऽभिधानान्नेति चेन्न तथा चेतोर्पणनिगदात् ॥1।1।25॥
3. उपदेशभेदान्नेति चेन्न उभयस्मिन्नप्यविरोधात् ॥1।1।27॥
4. जीवमुख्यप्राणलिङ्गान्नेति चेन्न उपासात्रैविध्यात् ॥1।1।31॥
5. स्मृत्यनवकाशदोषप्रसङ्ग इति चेन्न अन्यस्मृत्यनवकाशदोषप्रसङ्गात् ॥ 2।1।1॥

The word 'स्यादेतत्' is used in prose only. It has no place in poetry or aphoristic style. Dr. Jha says that while Kumaril employes it freely in his Tantravartika, it is very sparingly used in Prabhakara's Brihati.

As a matter of fact such usages are employed as warranted by the discussion about some particular meaning. The frequent or rare use of such words offers no ground for declaring that a